THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VI.—(XXVI).—APRIL, 1902.—NO. 4.

MR. SPENCER JONES' ESSAY TOWARDS REUNION.

IN the February number of this magazine I gave a summary of a remarkable book on Reunion with the Holy See, written by an Anglican clergyman, with an introduction by Lord Halifax. There is something further to be said about the book, as I stated then. And first, as to the aim and plan of the work. On its title-page it claims to be an "Essay towards Reunion." The author has made use of a careful mode of speech. He has perhaps advisedly refrained from entitling his work an "Essay on Reunion," choosing the more general form of "Essay towards Reunion." It may be that he has borne in mind a distinction which he employs in the book itself when dealing with the subject of Images. There he quotes approvingly the formula of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: "Thou shalt kneel if thou wilt *before* the image, but not *to* the image" (p. 368). It is not his object to exhaust the question of Reunion. He writes by way of suggestion, making no profession of compiling an exhaustive treatise. Yet even with this distinction before our eyes a critic may find it difficult at first sight to see that the author has a definite aim, or, if he has, that he has reached what he aimed at. Thus the critic may feel disposed to ask, Where is the suggestive feature of the work? Reunion is a practical subject. It means the coalition and coalescence of distinct and existent religious corporations. No doubt can be entertained that the Roman Catholic Church has a corporate existence. The same may be said about the Anglican Church, about which the author professedly writes. The reunion of these two bodies cannot take place by way of

religious compromise, unless compromise is to be merely the explanation and not the submergence of dogmatic truth. Neither can Reunion take place in a purely speculative and ideal plane. To be what it is desired to be, it must take the form of a real unity subsequent to real divergence and difference. Lord Halifax has a noteworthy paragraph in the Introduction. "As to the practical evils which result from religious divisions, they are too obvious to be insisted upon. There is no good work, religious or social, which would not be facilitated if the divisions which at present divide Christendom could be healed. Take the question of the religious education of the country. The whole of the difficulties and controversies which at present beset the cause of religious education are due to the religious differences which prevail among Christians. Consider the comparative failure of missionary enterprises; the fact that after nineteen hundred years of Christianity the greater part of the world is still unconverted; the alienation from all religious influences of the great masses of the population in England; the comparatively low standard of life in which the Christian world is contented to acquiesce; the little hold the supernatural has upon so many—and say whether for these and numberless other evils, the divisions of Christendom, and the results which those divisions have produced, are not responsible" (p. xiv). Assuredly if Reunion is to bring forth the practical results here foreshadowed by Lord Halifax, it must be preëminently a practical Reunion. I can, therefore, imagine a critic feeling dissatisfied because Mr. Spencer Jones has no practical scheme of Reunion,—no "Articles of Comprehension." And in truth the author has formulated no Treaty of Peace, or even drawn up conditions of an armistice.

Yet to conclude that in *England and the Holy See* there is no definite aim, or a definite aim and only indefinite means, is to mistake or overlook the spirit of the book. No one can read the grave, the very grave words of the author, without realizing that both he and his noble sponsor look upon the Reunion of Christendom as an enterprise which must not merely engage our affections, but command our energies. To labor for it, to pray for it, is every man's duty; to accomplish it, will be some saint's privilege. As the author says so well:

" . . A forlorn feeling comes over the mind at first, as if the whole enterprise were hopelsss; and we are tempted to abandon it in despair.

"There are cities of refuge awaiting us, if we should do so. We can use the old arguments that while Rome is what she is, Reunion is impossible; and that since so blessed a consummation is not destined to be attained in our day, we should continue to pray, but no longer work, for Reunion. Such arguments as these have the entire weight of our weaker nature on their side. The process of what is known as taking pains is never popular. . . . It is natural with us to swim with the tide, and mechanically repeat the old language of prejudice; and I have made some attempt in this essay to shake myself free of this mood which so easily overtakes me. Every one may do something in his own generation towards reducing the distance which separates the great body of Christians one from another, and that is all I have hoped for in what I have here attempted to say" (pp. 434, 435).

He believes that he will further the cause of Reunion by bearing witness to the Romeward bias of his own mind. As an Anglican he considers that he might personally be reunited to Rome, and he goes on to analyze the process of reconciliation. In these matters egotism is true humility. To insist on the first personal pronoun is not to glorify self, but to safeguard others against taking opinions for more than they are worth.

"Thus men of bias are the partial friends of the systems of thought which they affect; and a Reunion enterprise seeks to attract all those scattered forces to itself, and bids them sit down from time to time in some place, and say what they wish to say, not merely what is expected of them (p. 48)."

When Newman was asked to put down the Tracts which began the Oxford Movement, he wrote to Perceval:

"As to the Tracts, every one has his own taste. You object to some things, another to others. If we altered to please everyone, the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols *ex cathedra*, but as the expression of individual minds; and individuals feel strongly, while on the one hand they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, they are still peculiarly effective. No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. . . . The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful-minded) gains. This is the way of things; we promote truth by self-sacrifice." [1]

Mr. Jones might have written, if not a successful, at least an important and influential work, even if he had merely given utterance to his own very decided Romeward bias. But in truth he has done more than this. It has not been his aim to suggest the terms of agreement, but the lines of explanation. The famous

[1] *Apologia*, Ed. 1864, pp. 110, 111.

Tract 90 of Newman drew an explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles which attempted to house the Tridentine decrees. And many have been the explanations of Catholic doctrines written by Catholic theologians for the purpose of enlightening the traditional misinformation of Protestants. Mr. Jones has set himself the double task of setting down the lines of reconciliation, and, as an example, of giving from an Anglican standpoint a Catholic explanation of such doctrines as arrest peacemakers from the opposite camp. We cannot remember to have seen a fuller statement of the subjective principles of recovery (*i. e.*, of Reunion) than he has written. There is little, if anything, to be added to his five principles:—*Proportion*, which never detaches a phrase from its context, or an event from its environment, and always seeks the way of adjustment rather than alternatives; *Continuity*, which insists on giving things and events their historical genealogy, and would consider the ancient English Church the parent of, or at least the parent-in-law of, the present English Church; *Contact*, which makes it easy to take our opponent's standpoint when we are at his side; *Prayer*, which beseeches reunion from the Eternal Unity; and *Explanation*, which is the outcome of the four previous principles, and is the immediate source of reconciliation. Insistence on these principles of recovery can hardly fail to bring recovery more within reach.

But the most practical aim and effort of the book is to state the chief difficulties of the faith in a reconciliatory light. Emphasis is laid on the fact that the cleavage between Catholics and Anglicans is partly, if not wholly, due to misunderstandings. It cannot then be a subject of indifference to Catholics that at the beginning of the twentieth century we have a new thing in the Churches, an endeavor to explain the doctrines of the Church so as to narrow the separation between the Holy See and the most influential of the Reformed Churches.

This view brings us to a second point of discussion arising out of Mr. Spencer Jones' work. Men who pride themselves on their simplicity will be prompted to consider it unwise of the reviewer to render any sympathy towards the Reunion, fraught as it has been with so many blighted hopes and so many wrecked reputations. If Mr. Spencer Jones and others of his way of think-

ing are able to hold the whole chain of Catholic doctrine, their place would seem to be at the feet of the Holy See, not in the benefice list of the Established Church. It will be said, and with a show of reason, "Why cannot men like this follow their principles? And if a Church has come to this same high-water mark of dogma, why does it not wash away the narrow dykes of prejudice built up by statesmen three centuries ago, and mingle its waters once more with the great mother Church of Western Christendom?" There is much to be said for this view, which received its least persuasive form in the blunt antithesis of Bossuet, "Ou vient à nous qu'on accepte nos dogmes, ou bien alors pourquoi vient donc?" To begin with. We must not be supposed for a moment to hold that there can be any Reunion based on a suspension of the *de fide* dogmas of the Church. When we speak with praise of what has been done by Mr. Spencer Jones and such as he, we are merely showing our appreciation of their perseverance in making the headway they have made. We are not encouraging them to think there is still no further headway they must make. We can state the matter more clearly if we consider it in the individual rather than in a group or society of the individuals. We can well imagine many sincere and single-hearted Catholics saying that Mr. Jones and men of his stamp ought to join the Church of Rome, or, as we should say, the Catholic Church. But the matter to be decided is a matter of conscience. More than elsewhere is it necessary in ethical matters to employ distinctions. A general principle employed ruthlessly may mean the slaughter of a soul. Nothing could be more evident than the general principle *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, or, Every soul ought to join the Church. But we are not dealing with souls in general. We are not face to face with the Caius and Sempronius of our moral theologies. We are dealing with an individual with his intellectual, moral, and religious prejudices acquired unconsciously or inherited still more unconsciously. We are dealing with a conscience which has the essentials of a good conscience, but has not accurate information. We are in contact with a soul which is working towards the truth, and may be staggered in its present state by the pure truth. In the first ages of the Church use was made of the *Disciplina Arcani*. St. Thomas holds that

Moses in speaking to the Jews employed a divine *condescensio* and even spoke *secundum aequivocationem*. Must we say bluntly to men of the stamp of the writer of *England and the Holy See*: "There are no two ways about it,—either submit, or go." The case is one of false conscience. Confessors know with what prudence and kindness they must act when such consciences come for advice. They know that it is wrong to disobey the false conscience, and that it is not right to obey it. Yet practically an experienced confessor will have more hope for a soul that would rather do wrong in obeying its conscience, however false, than for another soul that would rather do right in disobeying its conscience though equally false. Thus the ethical questions involved in the case of men of Mr. Jones' temperament and belief are not to be solved by a stroke of the pen or by an easy *ipse dixit*. To bring pressure to bear on their minds and hearts in the hope of an immediate submission to the Holy See, would be to run great risks of banishing that submission without hope and into an unknowable future. It is not without reason that St. John begins the pages of his Gospel with the midnight visit of Nicodemus to our Blessed Lord. The humble ruler, to our unperceiving eyes, would have seemed ripe for conversion. Yet it needed the discipline of three long years, years of doubts conscientiously met and fought, years, it may be, of moral rising and falling, of intellectual dusk and dawn, before the soul was ripe for the table of the Master.

It may be so with some hundreds of souls in our own day. They have gone on under the divine lead to the very threshold of the Church. Thought may have outstripped feeling; or instinct may have outsped reason. A part of their being is already within the City of God; a part still remains without the walls. Then begins the hour of struggle and seeming failure. They think and cannot measure their thoughts or forecast the issue of them. They pray; yet have scarce a definite wish to be obtained. They are outwardly inconsistent, because they are inwardly torn in two. Were they not doubly watchful in their words, their divided thoughts might issue in contradictions. At all events, they give pain to their friends, and gladden only their enemies. Hardly knowing what they think, and wholly unconscious of

what they might come to think, their words are guarded. They state what seems to be true, in such a way that it may leave a loophole, if they should discover it to be false. Or they repeat with a monotony of self-deprecatory egotism, "I think," or "It seems to me," or "I hold it true," though no man can guarantee that to-morrow may not cast a new light on to-day and may not reverse many of its judgments and decisions. But while the light is as it is around them, they cannot do more than they are doing. Though, when the mist lifts, and they see things as they are, their whole being will move forward to the City of Peace.

What then shall we say to souls in this plight? Surely, not that they should come into the truth, before they yet hold it true. No; we must bid them obey the law of their own mind and go on thinking; we must urge them to yield to the instinct of their own soul, and go on praying. They must be true to themselves and to their past. Explanation has brought them far on their way; it may surely carry them the few paces that still remain.

What is said of individuals may in its measure be said of parties or Churches composed of individuals. Even as some souls are not ripe, yet are ripening for Reunion by way of submission; so Churches, though not ready to receive the Kiss of Peace, may yet be preparing to sing the *Credo*. For the moment we must attend to the duty of the moment. The duty of to-morrow will be best served by throwing ourselves whole-heartedly into the duty of to-day. A premature bringing into life may only lead to premature death. Newman bears testimony to the success of a policy of "let alone" with a class of minds. Of Dr. Russell, of Maynooth, he writes in the *Apologia:* "He had perhaps more to do with my conversion than anyone else. . . . He sent me at different times several letters; he was always gentle, mild, unobtrusive, uncontroversial. *He let me alone*" (p. 317). Doubtless because he realized that, although there was a principle *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, still false consciences must be dieted rather than mutilated, guided rather than dragooned.

There is just another question for discussion arising out of the subject-matter of *England and the Holy See*. No doubt the mere statement of our personal thoughts and bias forms a contribution to the enterprise, and, so to say, adds to the portfolio; yet a scheme

of Reunion must at some time or another be mooted in a practical way. Personal contact may indeed narrow the distance between the litigants. Yet there is much that may be mooted and set in order without personal contact. Even as some kind of working theory is needed for the unification of science—if it is only the theory of Atomism—so must some working plan be broached before attempts at Reunion can enter the sphere of practical ecclesiastical politics. To be practical, then, let us ask, How could a project for Reunion be formulated from the Anglican side? We are not unaware of the almost boundless possibilities for Reunion which exist among its members. There is intercommunion of the most absolute and practical character between men who hold sacerdotal claims as divine and men who abhor them as diabolical—between men who reserve what remains of the blessed bread and wine as the very Presence Itself and men who give it to their fowls or their swine—between men who hold Baptism to be the Gate of Heaven and men who hold it to be a happy contrivance for imposing a distinctive name—between men who worship Jesus Christ as the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and men who hold Him to be somewhat greater, say, than Plato in holiness and somewhat less than Plato in genius—between men who reconcile themselves to life and its momentous outcome by the firm belief in a Supreme Being, a Person, a Soul who loves and shepherds them, and men whose avowed object is to defœcate the idea of a Supreme Being to a pure transparency. These feats of intercommunion are at once the hope and despair of all zealous toilers for Reunion. For whilst they show that the English Establishment has an elasticity which makes its vertebration somewhat doubtful, they do not persuade the Church of Rome that she has anything to gain by intercommunion with those who are in communication with almost every error that she has ever anathematized. Is there anyone so quixotic to hope that Rome will ever communicate with those who communicate with Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Unitarians, Gnostics, and we are told Agnostics? Would it have been worth a man's while to suggest to St. Athanasius to reunite with men who tolerated the foes of ὁμοούσιος? What answer would have been made by St. Augustine had he been asked to communicate with the friends of

Pelagianism? The High Church party must try more and more to see that whilst the English Church is what she is, Reunion is impossible, because it would be a recognition or an active toleration of heresies which the anathemas of General Councils have declared to be intolerable. If the entire English Church were at the level of High Churchmen, then would Reunion seem not to be despaired of; until then it must remain a dream. Who will roll the stone away and make the English Church what it never has been, a dogmatic and religious unity? Such a one, if he come, will merit the title of a second Augustine of Canterbury and the Father of the English Church.

When this religious unity has been brought about, a second step will remain to be taken. While it still remains untaken, there seems no prospect of a reunion with the rest of Christendom. At the present time all jurisdiction is officially given by the State. The government appoints the bishops and controls the Establishment. When is it likely that Parliament with its servile submission to Protestant public opinion will allow the English Hierarchy to coquet with Rome? Under the present state of things the united Episcopate is unable, after formal declarations, to prevent the swinging of a censer or the lighting of a taper! When will they have the power to make England unlearn and unsay the traditions of three centuries and a half? If bishops are practically unable to oust clergymen from their livings who deny such fundamental doctrines as the Atonement and Baptismal Regeneration, when will the State think wise to send a flag of truce to Rome? It was precisely on the plea of foreign jurisdiction that the State threw over the Pope and set up the Established National Church. There is little hope that after three centuries and a half of uninterrupted success in governing the English Church by martial law it will own itself beaten and allow its bishops to open up negotiations with its old Master in spiritual affairs. Yet God alone knows how soon the parting wall may be thrown down. Signs are not wanting that Disestablishment may be the question of the hour, at no remote date. What views and possibilities such an event would open out no one can say. If it would add one to the chances and hopes of Reunion, it would not be in vain. And though much that is serviceable even as a

breakwater would come down in the falling, yet, on the whole, it would be a wounding only to cure,—a sickness, but not unto death.

A third subject must be faced before Reunion becomes immediately possible. Granted that some degree of dogmatic uniformity could be brought about within the English Church; granted, too, that through severance from the State or by the beneficence of the State the Anglican authorities were allowed a free hand to make overtures and arrange peace-meetings with the Roman authorities, there would still be the question of Anglican ordinations. It would be impossible to arrange that in any future Council the Anglican hierarchy should sit as bishops. Yet it might not be impossible for them to sit. Lutheran divines were called to Trent. English divines might even yet be summoned or at least be welcomed to a resumed Vatican Council. The Papal Bull "*Apostolicae Curae*" was looked upon in some parts as a final closing of the Roman door in the face of all seekers after Reunion. As the *Church Times* of January 24th says: "Five years ago the failure of a great effort was commonly said to put the Reunion of Christendom not merely beyond hope, but even beyond thought. The same had been said five and twenty years earlier, when the issue of the Vatican Council was a new and crushing blow. The earlier judgment was at fault; men recovered not quickly but completely from their disappointment; they found it less conclusive than they had imagined. The later judgment was more speedily falsified. It had a short vogue, if any; it is by now, we may say, forgotten." The papal decision on the validity of Anglican Orders could never long remain the parting wall between Canterbury and England. If the waters were to mount to this level, they would soon sweep the frail obstacle away, and those that have now been parted so long would be one anew.

It is in no spirit of criticism that we add these last three thoughts for the consideration not merely of men on the other side of the parting wall, but of men on this side. If individual conversions were the only means of spreading the Kingdom of God, it would be idle to say anything for or against the moot question of Reunion. But just as a society is a moral person, so may it have a moral progress or regress in doctrine and discipline. If individuals are

received into communion, so also may groups of individuals. We are not unacquainted with the reconciliation of large schismatical or heretical bodies in the East. And whilst we hold it a duty to urge men to reconciliation with the Mother Church of the West, and whilst we would never urge any one to remain an Anglican for the purpose of leavening his Church with orthodoxy, we can not shut our eyes to the fact that Catholic doctrine has been making vast strides logically and quantitatively within the circuit of the English Church. It, then, becomes a duty to view the movement for Reunion with eyes of interest and a heart of sympathy. The Pontiff who still, in God's mercy, reigns over us has set his sanction on the effort towards Reunion. Nay, his approval of the traditional Roman treatment of the Edwardine Ordinal was but a fatherly counsel against toiling for Reunion in empty mines. It was a timely warning-off from by-paths which led from the end in view. It would be easy to consider his decision as a mere reproof; whereas, like all things sacramental, it bore a hidden blessing. Even if it did nothing further, its tone of tenderness and painstaking, of sympathy and fatherly longing, made it a lesson to those amongst us who found it hard to deal with outsiders save as brands set aside for the burning.

We can then not merely sympathize with Mr. Spencer Jones' book, but with the larger issue which lies written in its pages. We have no difficulty in going with him heart and hand in the noble enterprise of Reunion. Even as we would not counsel him to stay where he finds himself, under the fatuous impulse of bringing his Church up to his level, so we would not forbid him to say what he has said so well, if by any means he might bring minds to a higher level where reconciliation might thrive and ripen to Reunion. The only chance of an understanding being arrived at is to show by our deeds that we sympathize with those whom it is hard to be parted from, and then to state as frankly as we may what we consider to be the cause of our differences. Until the cause of an illness is found, the cure cannot be suggested. I have stated as plainly as may be some of the grave practical difficulties which must come down before Reunion from our point of view is desirable or feasible.

It has been stated by holy men that the flood of Protestantism

was allowed to sweep over Christendom because of the sins of Catholic nations. Too long has that flood remained on the face of the earth. But now that the dove has gone forth to find a footing, and many hearts are lifted up in prayer, God alone can say how soon the waters will begin to decrease. A great soul devoted above all others to the Holy See has dared to utter a prophecy: "If Christians are ever to be reconciled, and everything calls them to it, it would seem that the movement must start with the Church of England."[2] Something like the fulfilment of this prophecy is beginning. May all true Catholics speed it with their prayers!

VINCENT MCNABB, O.P.

Woodchester, England.

A MESSENGER OF DIVINE LOVE.

THE movements that are being made in the direction of a higher social life for those whose early surroundings and later struggle for the mere means of living have made them unable to reach, are indications of what may be described as the distinctively modern manner of considering God. The old fear of Him has indeed not been lost; but with a wider knowledge of His works and a more intimate acquaintance with the mechanism of the world there has come a more profound realization of His goodness and, above all, of His love. It seems as if with the passing of time the light of the sun has become softer, the perfume of the flowers has become sweeter, and the lives of the humblest man and woman, hurt and shortened maybe by falls and follies, do not cause contempt any longer, but rather arouse sympathy and pity. It is true that the distinction between the rich and the poor is very plain; it must be admitted that there is restlessness and bitterness among those whose hands are hardened by toil that brings little wages; yet the rich and the poor as men and women are closer now than ever before, and the dependence of the toiler does not mean the slavery of the man. Words do not alleviate pain much; but the numberless public declarations of the brotherhood of men, the insistence on and development of the idea that all men are beloved children of an unseen

[2] De Maistre.

Father, have at last brought forth the full meaning of the words, and have made the idea become so real that it is a strong influence in social life. For there is in those words, and back of them in the idea of Divinity loving, something that seems like a bond binding all human hearts together. A personal interest is the result, an interest which develops into personal concern that some time will surely bring about improvements in the whole social system.

It is in concentrating the mind on the attribute of love, rather than on other Divine attributes, that the modern religious man differs from men of earlier ages and of remoter antiquity. During the Middle Ages, although Divine love was not forgotten, it was obscured somewhat by an overwhelming fear of Divine justice. This was due in a measure to the condition of the social state, and to the progress civilization was making. Wrong-doing was summarily punished; and the merciless decrees of human judges instilled a fear that developed into terror when men thought of the unseen Judge. In the days of chivalry even, when love was on every lip, and the laurel crown gave way to the silken ribbon from some fair hand, the spiritual love that filled the soul was rather the higher love of the creature for the Creator, than love coming from consciousness of the Divine attribute. Farther back in pagan times, there was love of the gods of the hearth and country; but there was no knowledge of an unmixed love of the god for his people. The gods were thought of as perfect men, and the attributes given them were the qualities and emotions of earthly men. Human beauty, therefore, they admired, not loved as a reflection of themselves, but admired as a distinct and beautiful creation. This was but a transference to the god of the prevalent passionate worship of beauty, not as an ideal, but of beauty with form, and color, and life.

The modern manner, however, of considering God, although expressed in new ways, and illustrated from wider knowledge than formerly, is no more than a deeper realization and manifestation of the teaching of Jesus. His whole life was a declaration of Divine love. But even with Him the declaration was not made for the first time. He, indeed, made it plainer for the world to understand, and by His human actions, His kind-

ness and forbearance, His intense interest in men, His tenderness and compassion manifested clearly that Divine love is something more tender, delicate, and permanent than any love the world ever knew—but all these were only more visible and, for mankind, more real indications of the love revealed centuries before. In this as in so many other ways Christ came to fulfil the law promulgated by the prophets.

Before the prophetic period knowledge of the attributes of God was adapted to the mental, political, and social state and conditions of the Israelites. In the earlier days the Israelites had little time for, or inclination towards, the acquisition of knowledge not quite necessary for their immediate wants. In their hands was the sword, and in their hearts was the desire of possessing the Promised Land. Across the Sinaitic desert, out from Kades into the mists of Moab, and down into the valley of the Ghor, they were struggling, falling and rising again, until, at last, they reached the plains of Jericho, and with the falling of the city's walls fell fear of the strangers' gods, and sprang up stronger trust in the might of their great battle God. Yahweh had guided the hosts of Israel through the dangers of sea and land, in battle He had fought for them, and with His aid and under His glory had the triumphant march been made. Waging war was the occupation of the invaders, and it was, therefore, as a war God that Yahweh was considered. His attributes to the warring mind were similar to those of a great military commander who possessed not only the skill to guide an army successfully, but also the physical strength to overcome an enemy. He was powerful, trustworthy, and intelligent, and these were the attributes by which He was known to the primitive Israelites. It is true that He was looked upon as the particular God who was Lord of Israel, and in conformity with the Semitic habit of thought, He was the Father of the tribes, and therefore possessed of a paternal regard for His own children; but the Israelitish mind was not quite prepared for the idea of a love so spiritual as to be universal. In fact, such an idea was hardly possible in those days. Every people had their own god, viewed as independent and sovereign in his own land and over his own people, so that an attribute which would imply wider domain and universality of objects would

have been incomprehensible. During the time of the Judges, and in the earlier years of the monarchy, Yahweh was still the great war God of the tribes and the nation. However, with the expansion of territory and the centralization of government in a human king, what was implicity contained in the known Divine attributes was drawn forth, and the wider dominion of Yahweh began to be realized. But with the success of Hebrew arms, and the establishment of a great kingdom, there arose a popular misunderstanding of the relations of Yahweh with the nation. The old Semitic idea of a kind of ownership of the tribal god had not altogether been erased. In consequence it was popularly believed that no matter what the faults of the nation might be, Yahweh would not completely destroy His people. Among the northern tribes this popular belief was one of the causes of destruction. The belief, too, made it difficult for the popular mind to understand the position Israel's God occupied among the peoples of the earth. The Israelite believed that all other peoples were walking in darkness, far beyond the light of the living God. After the division of the nation and the establishment of two distinct governments the popular confidence in Yahweh, especially in the Northern kingdom, was so distorted that wrong was wantonly committed, vice was openly prevalent, idolatry was practised, social leaders were notoriously bad, and yet the anger of Yahweh was considered as soothed by the daily offerings and official sacrifices. The time had evidently come for greater revelations.

Elijah gave an intimation of the Divine attribute; but it was in the very sanctuary of Beth-el that the justice of God was proclaimed by Amos. The opening chapters of his book considered as literature are masterly. In a series of powerful straightforward sentences he declares the crimes and punishments of the peoples around Israel. The punishments were the consequences of the crimes, and they were inflicted by Israel's own God. Gradually this thought is carried along until the conclusion stands out clearly and awfully that, since Israel has committed crimes as heinous as those of the neighboring nations, therefore a like punishment shall be meted out, for God is just. Terrible was the warning of the shepherd of Tekoa. The revelry and music in Beth-el must have ceased for a while as this new voice was ring-

ing through the streets, and as the fearful words were sinking into the listening crowds. An attribute of God was manifested that forboded the coming doom. But the music and revelry began again, and Amos was driven back to his native hills, and his solitary musings. However, misgivings had come into the minds of some. The old way of looking at Yahweh seemed wrong, and some swung from confidence to despair. Everything around was so bad, and the justice of God spoken of by Amos seemed to demand vengeance proportionate to the crimes daily committed, that God, in the minds of some, took on the character of a merciless Master bent on destroying. Hope therefore was waning; in the future there seemed to be nothing but the blackness of Sheol.

It was just at this time, however, that there was heard the voice of one whose words were from the heart, and whose message revealed a forgotten phase of God. The messenger was Hosea, and his words were of love. The manner in which Providence acts in the affairs of men is plainly seen in the human circumstances surrounding manifestations of a divine attribute. Amos came with his warning words of a future retribution in the days of Israel's greatest splendor and prosperity; Hosea's larger message was delivered in years of anarchy and national calamities. Both seers lived during the reign of Jeroboam II, but the life of Hosea extended on into the reign of Menahem.

After the terrifying destruction of the house of Omri by Jehu, the political fortunes of the Northern Kingdom underwent many vicissitudes. In the reign of Jehoahaz, son of Jehu, Israel became a vassal of the king of Damascus. But Joash, grandson of Jehu, succeeded in throwing off the Syrian yoke, and obtained possession of many of the towns taken from his father. In his reign a new era of prosperity began for Israel, and continued with increased national glory during the reign of his successor, Jeroboam II (781–740). External circumstances contributed to the success of Jeroboam II. The attacks of Salmanassar III and of Assurdân III on Damascus completely crippled the Syrian kingdom. Assyria then too, under the peaceful Assurnirâr, ceased extensive military operations to such an extent that the Israelitish king extended his authority far north into Syria. Southeast also, into the land of the Moabites, were his victorious arms carried, so that the

writer in the Book of Kings could record that "he restored the coasts of Israel from the neighborhood of Hamath unto the Sea of the Plain."

The Book of Kings gives little information of the social condition of Israel during the prosperous years of Jeroboam's reign; but fortunately there is an abundant source in the writings of the contemporaries of the king, Amos and Hosea. The commercial spirit promoted by David, and fostered by Solomon, tended towards building up of towns and the growth of town life. The necessity of war, also, required centralization of forces and aided in the advancement of the town. Along with town life came the establishment of royal officials, and as they enjoyed royal privileges and more abundant means for acquiring wealth, social contrasts arose, and the rich and the poor began to form themselves into distinct classes. The holdings of the poor gradually became smaller; usury and oppression diminished them more, and at last justice became so corrupted that the poor lost all means of acquiring what had been taken away. The old simplicity of family life vanished also. Cedar and ivory palaces arose, soft damask pillows covered the floors, jeweled rings, bracelets, and flowing silken robes were worn, and the austere meal of the olden time gave way to sumptuous banquets enlivened by the music of the minstrels and the rhythmic movements of the dancers. Nor did the moral life remain high any more. The pages of Amos and Hosea contain lists of moral crimes of the blackest kind. Prosperity and wealth had, indeed, brought moral corruption that sapped the strength of the people, made them lovers of luxury and ease, and took away the sturdy manliness, uprightness, honesty, and cleanness that in former times enabled Israel to brave the dangers and starvation of the wilderness, and endure the misery and pain of the years of conquest. Even the religious life of the people of the Northern Kingdom had deteriorated. Sabbaths and the new moons were strictly celebrated; sacrifices and tithes were carefully offered to Yahweh; the ancient sanctuaries of Beth-el and Dan were filled with votaries, and many other sanctuaries were scattered over the land; but the purity of the Yahweh worship was gone. The Bull as the symbol of Yahweh was to be found everywhere; the Teraphim was adored, and beside the altar

of the Lord stood the maççeba, the sacred pillar that had come down from Canaanitish times. The Ashĕra, also, a heathen symbol of fruitfulness, was worshipped. With these heathen symbols before their eyes, and with the corruption of the whole social system staring them in the face, it is not strange that Amos and Hosea proclaimed the coming doom of the people. After the death of Jeroboam it seemed as if the days of retribution had come at last. He was succeeded by his son Zachariah, who was killed at the end of six months by Shallum. Shallum never acquired undisputed possession of the throne, and at the end of a month was captured and slain by Menahem. These changes on the throne broke up the power and prosperity of Israel. Civil war with the devastations that followed it, distrust, riot, anarchy, and murder, ruined the people forever. Menahem could not retain his throne without foreign help, and, in consequence, he became a vassal of the Assyrian king. It is not strange, then, that those who had the welfare of their country at heart looked longingly towards Judah, where the dynasty still ruled, and thought that the division of the nation had been cursed by God.

It was during the troubled reign of Menahem that the greater part of Hosea's prophecies were uttered. There are few characters in Hebrew literature whose personal lives stand out so plainly as does the life of this ancient messenger of Divine love. It seems indeed as if Providence had so willed it. For love is something so intimately bound up with a man's personality, so directive is it of all his actions, so strong is its influence even on his mental movements, that it is difficult to be realized as an abstract emotion of an immaterial will. Love's messenger must bear some form; the heart somehow must be visible. And this is why Hosea is so attractive. He has left a vivid picture, not of his physical form, but of his heart and mind, and after all these make up the true man. Moreover, he has opened wide the door of his own house, and shown the sadness and the desolation there. Even now he may be pictured standing there in the empty room, his face pale and drawn, his eyes staring into vacancy, his heart breaking with the pain only a noble sensitive man can feel, his whole being seemingly crushed by the loneliness and shame that have come upon him, and yet feeling the same old love of

years before. But it was the love he had and the misery he suffered that were preparations, in Yahweh's own way, for the reception of the message he was to deliver to mankind.

Of the early life of Hosea, son of Beëri, nothing is known. It is certain, however, from the whole tenor of his book and from his allusions to "our king" that he was born and grew up in the Northern Kingdom. Unlike Amos, therefore, who came from Judah, he was not an outsider; but the lives and fortunes of Ephraim were bound up with his own life and fortune. It is this fact that adds to the peculiar pathos of his book. When the message of Amos was rejected, he could feel that his work was done; and although filled with sorrow yet could turn away from the corrupt scenes around him, and go back again to the purer air and the simple shepherd folk of his native land. But to Hosea the corrupt scenes could not be left so easily; behind them he could yet trace the disappearing outline of better times and better men, and to those distant times and men he was bound by affection and by birth. Although his early life is unknown, yet he himself has put down a record of the calamity that fell upon him, and in doing that has shown to the world the beauty of his character, the influences that changed and moulded his life, and the history of his manhood years that have made him known more intimately, and have stirred up more sympathy than a far more lengthy story could have done.

The opening chapters of the prophet's book contain a narrative of his wedded life. They are written as if he had hesitated for a long time before disclosing his inner life, as if he had struggled to repress the story, and then as if moved by some mighty power, had brushed away the tears that dimmed his eyes, and allowed his pen to rapidly move along, and, in imperishable words, convey to the world the knowledge of the grief that tore his heart. His grief was great, but a manifestation of it was necessary in order that the iniquity of the nation and the loving kindness of God might be made more real and plain.

During the latter part of the reign of Jeroboam II, and when Hosea was a young man, he loved and married Gomerbath Diblain. It is only from allusions here and there in the narrative that an idea may be had of the character of the prophet's wife.

But that character was plainly the reverse of his. She seems to have been frivolous and vain, fond of fine dress, of the glitter of golden ornaments, and of the gay luxurious life around her. She was a daughter of the warm Oriental sunshine, and the open air and soft perfume of the groves gradually made the stillness of her home repellant, and affection for her family wane. Love for her children, even, did not break the spell that had come upon her, nor did their appeal, nor the mournful pleadings of Hosea make her forget her false friends and clear away the gloom that was fast settling down upon her home. At last the blow that had long seemed hanging in the air fell, and she left the house of her children and husband. Although the lines recording that day of shame were written long after, yet the horror and agony that filled the prophet's heart stand out plainly in the broken sentences and vehement rush of thought. Love of her had become a part of his very life; the fickle, worldly woman had bound the sincere meditative poet with bonds he could not shake off or ever break. But her life of pleasure became after awhile a life of pain; youth and fairness grew old and faded, and she sank down to the value of a worn-out and useless slave. But even then Hosea loved her, and going forth he freed her from her bondage, and took her back into his home again. Tenderly and carefully he ministered to her, and although a fatal wound had been inflicted on his life-happiness, yet he sought to blot away the memory of the past, and by loving kindness kindle again in her heart the love that had gone out.

But the blot that brought such sadness into the life of Hosea, and the love he ever had for his fallen wife, were destined to become tangible examples of the doctrine he had been set apart to preach. Everything around now took on a different aspect. Brooding over his own pain, and over the unfaithfulness of her whom he loved, made his vision clearer, and the Divine Spirit that came upon him, made him able to understand the causes that were hurling Israel to destruction, and able to see the only means by which that destruction could be averted. Israel in his mind became the Spouse of Jehovah, and like his own wife was a faithless spouse. Among the primitive Semites, just as among the later Greeks, the idea of the marital union of a god with earth was

prevalent. The showers coming from the sky and making the ground fruitful were looked upon as indications of the union. A trace of the primitively natural notion may be seen in these words of Hosea:

> ". . . I will love them freely . . .
> I shall be like the dew unto Israel;
> He shall blossom as the lily,
> And send forth his roots like Lebanon."

But with Hosea it was not the land that was the spouse of Yahweh. It was the nation. It is as a person, therefore, that the nation is considered, and as a person the prophet mercilessly sets forth its sins. Just as in his own home the sins of his wife were faithlessness and desertion, so, too, were those sins of Yahweh's spouse. Forgetful of the past, Israel became saturated with the heathen spirit that seemed to permeate the air. The Baalims of the Canaanites were worshipped everywhere, and along with the foreign gods came revelries, immoralities, and the consecrated sins of the groves:

> "Upon the tops of the mountains they sacrifice,
> And upon the hills they burn incense,
> Under oaks and poplars and terebinths,
> Because their shaded places are pleasant."

So completely was Israel bent on the ways of the heathen that "their doings will not suffer them to turn to their God." There was not in the land any more truth or mercy or knowledge of God; nothing but swearing and breaking faith, killing and stealing and uncleanness; all had broken out and blood touched blood. But faithlessness was not the only crime the prophet unflinchingly denounced. Such a blight had come upon the national mind that the fundamental fact of the political state was ignored. The real King of Israel was Yahweh; the human king was only His representative. In times of political peril, therefore, the nation should rely not on any human help, but on the aid of the ancient battle God. Instead, however, of calling on the Lord, "Ephraim went to Assyria, and sent to king Jareb." Israel had "cast off that which is good: the enemy shall pursue him. They have set up kings," said the Lord, "but not by me." To the sensitive mind of the prophet this was sinking to the lowest

depths of infamy. He knew what a terrible crime desertion was. He had loved, and his loved one had gone from him. And remembering the past he saw that Yahweh had loved the nation, and just as he still loved, so did he know that Yahweh, too, still loved Israel. Filled with this inspired thought he pleaded and preached Divine love. In the midst of fierce denunciations of the people, he became gentle, and sadly the words came forth:

> "I took them in my arms,
> But they knew not that I healed them,
> I drew them with cords of a man,
> With bands of love."

And again:

> "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?
> How shall I deliver thee, Israel?
> How shall I make thee as Admah?
> How shall I set thee as Zeboim?
> My heart is turned within me,
> My loving kindness is kindled."

Yahweh is shown with a love almost human in its tenderness and delicacy. The way the prophet expresses it, makes it seem like the mournful affection of a breaking human heart. The pathos, too, is heightened when he changes from the delineation of it as the love of a husband for his wife to the softer love of a father for his child. The memory of Israel's years of misery in the wilderness seems ever in the mind of Yahweh, and the helplessness of those years seems even when Israel had grown to bring pangs of pity. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." It is the affection of a father when he fondles his little children that is here brought out. Homer has portrayed Hector caressing his child, and the picture of the strong warrior and his boy have become fixed in the memory of mankind; but Hosea's manifestation of the love of the Mighty God for a faithless nation has become not only fixed in the memory of men, but has saved many a wanderer from the dreariness of despair. The word by which he designates divine love has too a peculiar appropriateness. It conveys also an idea of the doctrine he was appointed to preach distinct from the message of Amos. The word *hesed* is not found in the latter's book. The Hebrew

word *hesed* as used by Hosea has a meaning that even the word "love" hardly conveys. It means rather a clinging affection, loving kindness. The best example of the meaning of the word, from a human point of view, is Hosea's own devotion to his wife. In the story of that devotion are found all the elements that go to make up the concept conveyed by the word. It is a word therefore most expressive, and when applied to the devotion of Yahweh to Israel, it seems to bring down the great Being who is

> ". . . clothed with honor and majesty;
> Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment,
> Who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain,
> Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters,
> Who maketh the clouds his chariot,
> Who walketh on the wings of the wind,"

—it seems to bring down to earth this great Being and make Him long for and strive to win the affection of a vacillating, foolish nation. And as the fatherly devotion and love will make a man reward the members of his own house for the little acts of kindness they may do him, so also does Hosea proclaim the promises and rewards Yahweh has made and shall give if Israel returns to Him. The past shall all be forgotten and forgiven; the loving kindness of the Lord shall be extended to Ephraim, whose iniquities have made him prematurely old, for "gray hairs are here and there upon him, and he knoweth it not."

> "I will ransom them from the power of the grave,
> I will redeem them from death.
> O death where are thy plagues?
> O grave where is thy destruction?"

And again:

> "I will not execute the fierceness of my anger,
> I will not return to destroy Ephraim,
> For I am God, and not man,
> The Holy One in the midst of thee."

Yahweh assuredly has more affection and love than even the tenderest of human hearts. Hosea could still love the spouse of his youth; but even his love was not great enough to reinstate her as the wife of his old age; the God of Israel, however, was willing to restore the fallen nation to its former place as His chosen and beloved people. It was a new and strange message

that the prophet brought to men. It was like drawing aside the curtain that had concealed from men the real glory of heaven.

And yet so perverse had become the popular mind, that the message of Hosea was not heeded by the nation. The people had consulted their stocks, and their staff had declared unto them deception. Now and then, when anarchy and tyranny had become unbearable, a cry went up to Yahweh; but repentance was like a morning cloud, and as the dew that goeth away in the morning. Israel had indeed sown the wind, and was to reap a whirlwind. Samaria had stirred up at last the bitterness of God; but before the end came, and the Assyrian had desolated his beloved land, Hosea died. But although his nation was broken up, and his people carried away, the marvellous message he was commissioned to preach gradually became more widely known and healed many a wounded heart.

With all its depth of meaning, however, the love which Hosea announced was the love of Yahweh for the nation. The prophet himself realized the Divine attribute so vividly that for him it became something personal; but it was not a personal love that he proclaimed. It was a love that was suited to the intelligence of the times, to the days when the individual and the nation were so intimately united that one could not be independent of the other. When the nation was broken up, the message may have been read far away in the Mesopotamian valley, but the hope which it enkindled was the hope of a national return, and the upbuilding again of Israel among the nations of the earth.

Clearly for mankind of later times a more personal manifestation of Divine love was necessary. And this more personal manifestation came in the fulfilling of Hosea's teachings by Christ. It is in the light of the old Hebrew prophet's declaration that the words of Christ can be really understood, when He said that God so loved men, not the nations but individual men and women, that He sent His only Son among them. It is this wider adaptation of the prophecies of Hosea that has brought about such a wonderful change in the relations of man with man. The God of armies has become the God of love—the clinging affectionate love that attracts man and man, and through men to God Himself.

ENEAS B. GOODWIN.

Chicago, Ill.

ST. THOMAS ON THE MEMORY.

AT page 198 of the Rev. Father Maher's *Psychology*,[1] a work that has won for its author well-deserved recognition and commendation from the Faculty of London University, the following passage is to be found:

"There has been much subtle discussion among the schoolmen as to the forms and modes of memory which are to be deemed sensuous or intellectual. St. Thomas, in a well-known passage,[2] says: 'Cognoscere praeteritum *ut praeteritum* est sensus,' but the 'ut praeteritum' may have more than one signification. Suarez maintains that 'intellectus rem cognoscit cum affectionibus seu conditionibus singularibus perfectius multo quam sensus'; also that 'Sensus novit praeteritum tantum materialiter, intellectus vero formaliter.' Amongst recent text-books of note, Lahousse asserts: 'Absurdum est (dicere) memoriae sensitivae proprium esse apprehendere *praeteritum determinatum, uti est praeteritum*,' and he urges, 'Ens praesens non apprehenditur a sensu tamquam praesens; apprehendi enim deberet ratio praesentiae ut sic, quae ratio abstracta non attingitur a sensu.' Sanseverino defends a somewhat different view. St. Thomas appears to say at times that past events are cognized as past *per se* by sense, and only *per accidens* by intellect; elsewhere, however, he implicitly distinguishes between the remembrance of a past object and of the percipient act by which it was apprehended. The memory of the former he considers as *per se* sensuous, though *per accidens* it may belong to intellect."

The citation from St. Thomas, embodying the statement about sensuous memory which Lahousse so emphatically contradicts, is also given in the earlier edition of Father Maher's work. On looking up recently the passage to which Father Maher gives reference, I have found that St. Thomas, so far from saying that "it is the part of sense to perceive the past *as past*," teaches almost the exact opposite. Here is a literal rendering of the whole passage:

The faculties of the soul are not specifically distinguished by a distinction in the objects, unless it be such as belongs *per se* to the objects precisely inasmuch as they are the objects of these faculties. Hence heat and cold, which belong to colored surface *per accidens*, do not as such differentiate the faculty of sight. For it is the same sense of sight that sees a hot colored surface and a cold colored surface, a sweet colored thing and a bitter colored thing. And while the intellect can in some sort be aware of the past, yet because it perceives indifferently present, past, and future, the relation of past and present does not belong *per se* to the object of the intellect as such. For this reason—though there is, after a fashion, a memory in the intellectual part of the soul—it is not a faculty *per se* distinct from the others (intellect and will), in the sense philosophers speak of the faculties as distinct. This memory (*i. e.*, memory

[1] London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1900.

[2] *Qu. Disp. de Verit.* q. x, a. 3, c.

as a distinct faculty) is to be found only in the sensitive part of the soul, which has for its object the present as such. Hence, if it has to have a perception of the past, there is needed a faculty of higher order than sense itself.[3]

The teaching of St. Thomas, therefore, is that the present as such is the proper object of sense, and that if there is to be a perception of the past in the sensitive part of the soul, a faculty higher than sense itself is required. When he says "sense itself," he means those sensuous faculties that have for their object the present as such, to wit, the external senses, together with the complementary internal sense known as the *sensus communis* or *sensorium commune;* for these and these only are the faculties of the sensitive part of the soul that have the present as such for their object. *The aliqua altior virtus quam ipse sensus* is itself *in parte sensitiva*, and is the sensuous memory, which has for its object the past as such. Thus intellect apprehends present, past, and future indifferently; sensuous memory, the past as such; sense, the present as such. Thus, too, past events are cognized as past only *per accidens* by intellect, not because of any deficiency in the intellect, but rather because of its greater perfection, since it takes in present, past, and future indifferently and is not limited to any of these determinately. And past events are cognized as past, not by sense, which is limited to the present, but by sensuous memory, which has the past as such for its object.

When the Saint says that sense has for its object the present as such, he is contrasting sense sharply with intellect, which apprehends the being or nature of a thing without reference to time, present, past, or future. It should be observed that the intellect, besides this direct act by which it grasps the essence of a thing

[3] Potentiae non diversificantur ex diversitate objectorum, nisi diversitas objectorum sit ex his quae per se accidunt objectis secundum quod sunt talium potentiarum objecta: unde calidum et frigidum, quae colorato accidunt in quantum hujusmodi, non diversificant potentiam visivam: ejusdem enim potentiae visivae est videre coloratum calidum et frigidum, dulce et amarum. Quamvis autem mens sive intellectus aliquo modo possit cognoscere praeteritum, tamen cum indifferenter se habeat ad cognoscenda praesentia, praeterita, et futura, differentia praesentis accidentalis intelligibili est in quantum ejusmodi. Unde quamvis in mente aliquo modo possit esse memoria, non tamen potest esse ut potentia quaedam per se distincta ab aliis, per modum quo Philosophi de distinctione potentiarum loquuntur; sed haec solummodo potest inveniri memoria in parte sensitiva, quae fertur ad praesens in quantum est praesens: unde si debeat ferri in praeteritum, requiritur aliqua altior virtus quam ipse sensus.

or attribute out of all relation to time, in which we distinguish present, past, and future, has also a reflex act by which it can think on its own act, its own thought, and compare one act with another, and one period of time with another period of time. In this way it comes to know formally the present as such, and the past as such, and the future as such. Sense, on the other hand, being organic, has no power either of reflection or of abstraction, and requires to be stimulated into activity by some object here and now present to it. Sense proper is therefore tied down absolutely to the present. Hence the Saint concludes that, while the same intellectual faculty is capable of perceiving the past as well as the present, the same sensuous faculty is not, and that sensuous memory must accordingly be a distinct faculty from sense proper, which has for its object the present as such—not that it perceives the *ratio praesentiae ut sic*, or, in other words, is conscious of the present as present by a reflex act, which is proper to intellect only, but that it cannot reach out to the past or the future, as does the intellect, being by its very nature rigidly limited in its range to that which is here and now present to it.

In the *Summa*,[4] the Saint gives another reason why sensuous memory must be a distinct faculty. He points out that not only is its *per se* object distinct from that of sense proper, which is the reason assigned above, but it must have its seat or organ in a different part of the brain from that which is the seat of any other faculty. The *sensus communis* receives into itself the impressions produced upon the external senses, distinguishes between them, and coördinates them. Being, however, but the common centre of the external senses, it has no perception of aught save that which is first perceived by some one of these. Now, as a matter of fact, the animal has a perception of something above and beyond that which it perceives by the external senses—of something which no external sense ever can perceive; it perceives something, not merely as agreeable or otherwise to a given sense, but as remotely useful or noxious to itself or its kind. Thus the bee gathers wax, not because it is pleasant to any of its senses, but because it is useful for building a hive; and the swallow haunts the muddy pools, which its external senses should

[4] 1ª, q. 78, a. 4, c.

make it fight shy of, seeking under the guidance of an inner sense fit material to build a nest in which to hatch its brood of young ones. This inner sense which the schoolmen in their own language called *aestimativa*, we in English call *instinct*. It enables the animal to perceive in the objects perceived by the external sense something which neither the external sense itself nor the complementary internal *sensus communis* perceives—certain concrete relations of utility, disadvantage, danger, and the like, and among these the relation of past time as distinguished from present, or rather—because that is an abstract relation—the relation of identity between the thing here and now perceived and the same thing before perceived in some past period of time. So far forth, therefore, as sensuous memory consists in the *recognition* of some past sensuous experience, it is identical with the faculty known as *instinct*.[5]

But it is in so far as it conserves or retains past sensuous experiences that sensuous memory is to St. Thomas a distinct faculty. "It is a function of memory," he says, "to conserve impressions of things that are not actually perceived."[6] Now, he argues, in the case of faculties that are attached to corporeal organs, the faculty that is well fitted to receive impressions is ill fitted to retain them, and conversely. An organ that is moist and soft is good to receive impressions, but not to retain; on the other hand, one that is dry and hard is good to retain but not to receive. He concludes, therefore, that as the *sensus communis*, which receives

[5] Of course it must be the same faculty that knows or perceives a thing for the first time, and then knows again or recognizes it. Memory as a faculty distinct from the *aestimativa* is, according to St. Thomas, but a *thesaurus specierum*—a storehouse, in which the impressions made on the *aestimativa* are conserved, and whence they are reproduced. This intimate relation between the two faculties is shown, as the Saint points out, first, by the fact that memory in the animal starts from an impression of hurt previously received, or danger previously apprehended, or utility previously noted—all of which belong to the *aestimativa*; and secondly, by the fact that the relation of the past as such can be perceived only by instinct as distinguished from sense proper. It should also be observed that, while the phantasy or imagination ministers to memory, the distinctive function of memory (including under that term for the nonce, both instinct and its *thesaurus specierum*), which is the perception of the past as such, transcends imagination, as do also many internal experiences bound up with the appetites and affections that are nevertheless remembered by the animal.

[6] 1ª q. 79, a. 6, c.

impressions from the external senses, has as its complementary faculty the phantasy or imagination to conserve and reproduce these impressions, so the *aestimitiva* or instinct, which receives into itself impressions of concrete relations not perceived by the external sense or the *sensus communis* (hence spoken of by the schoolmen *intentiones insensatae*), has for its complementary faculty sensuous memory to conserve its impressions in like manner and reproduce them. I may here remark that the Saint's theory has received happy illustration and confirmation in our own day. The inventive genius of Edison has given us the phonograph, an instrument which is admirably adapted to receive impressions of sound, but not very well adapted to retain and reproduce them. The reason is that the wax cylinder used in the phonograph is soft and plastic—susceptible of impressions, but not retentive. Within the last few years, however, Berliner, by the use of vulcanized india-rubber discs that are perfectly dry and hard, has overcome the deficiency noted in the phonograph, and his instrument, the gramophone, while quite incapable of receiving impressions, retains them for all time. The gramophone disc is practically an indestructible record of sounds. And so man, in perfecting these instruments, has but copied the devices first employed by the Author of nature when He "made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds," and formed Adam's body "of the slime of the earth."

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

OBSERVATIONES ET CASUS DE SANATIONE MATRIMONII IN RADICE.

III.

INVESTIGATIONE facta in casu praecedenti[1] inventum est, Jodocum Diaconum cum Maevia matrimonium contraxisse coram ministro acatholico; post decem annos vero Maeviam offensam, quod Jodocus cum ejus sorore intimior esset quam cum ipsa et cum hac copulam habuisset, eum reliquisse, attamen iterum post

[1] THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, March, 1902, p. 270.

sex menses cum eo reconciliatam esse et post hoc, exceptis quibusdam rixis et altercationibus, cum eo pacifice in matrimonio putativo convixisse. Casum Missionarii, ab Episcopo loci facultatibus etiam Formulae D et E pro Missione in illo loco habenda exornati, susceperunt componendum. Quaeritur nunc:

A. An et quibus sub conditionibus Missionarii dispensationem in radice hujus matrimonii exequi possint?

B. An renovatio consensus matrimonialis a Jodoco sit facienda?

C. Quid, si Maevia nunc insanae mentis in hospitali commorans, sana facta educationem irreligiosam liberorum omittere minime vellet?

D. Quomodo Jodoco relate ad matrimonium cum Maevia succurrendum?

Resp. ad A. Dispensationem in radice, si tamen talis fieri potest, Missionarii exequi possunt tum tantum, si facultates praedictas (*a*) valide acceperunt, et (*b*) servatis servandis applicant.

Quod spectat (*a*) acceptationem, haec valet solum: (1) pro remotioribus locis Dioecesis (ergo non valet si missio celebratur in loco propiori residentiae Episcopi); (2) pro aliquo numero casuum (ergo non valet concessio *generaliter* facta); (3) pro numero casuum *urgentiorum* (ergo non valet pro casibus, in quibus applicatio sine gravi incommodo differi potest); (4) pro numero casuum urgentiorum, *in quibus recursus ad Episcopum haberi non potest* (ergo non valet pro casibus, licet urgentioribus, in quibus sine gravi incommodo ad Episcopum pro dispensatione vel sanatione facienda recurri potest). Praedicta de omnibus facultatibus dictarum Formularum valent; non tantum de ea, quae pro sanatione matrimoniorum conceditur. Attamen, quoad hanc valde dubium est, an fuerit acquisita, si nominatim non fuerit expressa; nam juxta regulam juris 81, in 6° et cap. *Si Episcopus* 2, V. 10 in 6° in generali concessione non comprehenduntur ea, quae quis (*hic* Episcopus) in specie verisimiliter non esset concessurus. Demum dubium adhuc moveri potest, an concessio pro omnibus missionariis valeat et non potius pro uno. Nam Episcopus ad summum tribus presbyteris sub praedictis conditionibus facultates harum Formularum subdelegare potest. Ideo verisimiliter noluit, se omnino pro locis aliis remotioribus spoliare; imo nec potuit

omnes Missionarios, si eorum fuerint tres, facultatibus istis ditare in suppositione, quod eas jam aliis presbyteris subdelegaverit nec eas revocaverit.

Quod dein spectat (*b*) applicationem earum, servanda sunt, quae generatim in executionibus rescriptorum servari debent. Id tantum praedictis Formulis proprium est, ut executor non quidem de valore actus, at vero sub gravi peccato teneatur poenitentiam salutarem imponere iis, quorum res dispensationi obnoxia quovis modo in culpa fuerit fundata, necnon congruam eleemosynam arbitrio Episcopi erogandam, ideo ei transmittendam, at non de valore, nec etiam (ut videtur) sub ullo peccato, si partes essent pauperrimae et vix minimam possent eleemosynam erogare.

Resp. ad B. Relate ad consensus renovationem in eo, cujus matrimonium in radice est sanandum, plura advertenda sunt:

(*a*) Modus ordinarius matrimonia (propter impedimentum juris ecclesiastici) invalida revalidandi est dispensatio simplex. Sanatio in radice tantum adhiberi potest, ubi illa moraliter impossibilis est.

(*b*) Per sanationem in radice lex irritans ecclesiastica a Summo Pontifice (qui solus hoc efficere potest) in casu particulari revocatur et quidem per *fictionem* juris[2] (ergo facta non fiunt infecta, quod impossibile est) jam ab initio matrimonii, ita ut sublato obice legis habilitas naturalis vim suam exserere possit: ergo consensus in matrimonium (in quo consensu consistit ejus initium et radix), prius propter legem oppositam infirmus et vitiatus, evadat sanus (= sanetur) et legitimus, et consequenter etiam proles, durante matrimonio (non antea) progenita, reddatur legitima, ac si impedimentum numquam exstitisset.[3]

Porro si consensus, per sublationem obicis sanatus, perseverat, matrimonium ipsum tempore sanationis, cum ipsum sub juris fictionem cadere nequeat, validum fit etiam absque ulteriori actu seu

[2] De fictionibus juris *cfr.* Reiffenst. I, tit. 2, n. 176 seq. Haec tamen ratio explicandi sanationem matr. in radice mere doctrinalis est et a multis adhibita. Aliter rem explicat Müllendorf in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.*, Innsbr. 1879, p. 473 seq.

[3] Unde qui, ut illegitimus, beneficium ecclesiasticum, in Statu Pontificio munus civile, illicite vel invalide obtinuit et ad dimittendum beneficium vel munus et ad fructus restituendos tenebatur, per sanationem in radice, qua legitimus fit, ac si ab initio matrimonium fuisset validum, censetur beneficium vel munus legitime obtinuisse et conservasse, ac liber a dimissione ejusdem, et a restitutione fructuum.

consensus renovatione, excepto casu, quo legislator, qui obicem constituit et eum aufert, velit, ut obicis sublatio vi destituatur, nisi consensus renovetur ab una vel etiam ab utraque parte. Eo momento dein, quo obex tollitur, matrimonium fit validum et per fictionem juris effectus supra expositi subintrant et quidem si in una parte per consensus renovationem matrimonii validatio fit, sanatio consensus in altera tantum fit, et dicitur a quibusdam[4] *imperfecta*, qualis multo magis ea est, in qua *utriusque* consensus renovatio injungitur (uti fieri intendebatur in causa Pragensi ap. Ben. XIV. *Quaest. Can.*, 174),[5] dum e contra ea sanatio matrimonii in radice *perfecta* est, in qua consensus ab initio mutuo datus in utraque parte sanatur absque ulla consensus renovatione. Objicitur contra *imperfectam* sanationem, quasi sit res defectuosa; attamen rite considerata *actus* perfectior est, quam perfecta sanatio, quia imperfecta sanatio magis assimilatur dispensationi simplici. Quare non mirarer, si S. Sedes toties, quoties una pars in consensu ab initio praestito permanet nec ejus renovationi obnititur, consensus renovationem praescriberet.

Ad particularia veniens observo sequentia:

1. A S. Sede consensus renovatio non praescribitur, si multa matrimonia *in globo* sanantur, prout hoc ex. gr. factum est in imperio Austriaco per Litteras Apostolicas de 17 Mart. 1856,[6] ad singulos hujus imperii Episcopos directas, ut iis acceptis[7] sanare potuerint "matrimonia sine dispensatione Apostolica contracta non obstante impedimento cognationis spiritualis et legalis, affinitatis ex copula illicita, justitiae publicae honestatis ex matr. rato et non consummato in 3 et 4 gradu, necnon ex matr. invalide contracto et non consummato, sive ex sponsalibus proveniente, itemque impedimento consanguinitatis seu affinitatis in gradu 3 et 4 etiam tangente secundum, dummodo matrimonia celebrata fuerint juxta formam a Conc. Trid. praescriptam nec iisdem matrimoniis aliud canonicum obstet impedimentum."

2. In casibus particularibus, pro eorum indole consensus reno-

[4] Sabetti n. 931, Lehmk. II, 831; M. De Luca *de reb. eccl.*, n. 217.

[5] Injunctio renovationis consensus in *utraque* parte alias vix unquam occurrit.

[6] Kutschker, V, p. 365.

[7] In Archidioecesi Vindobonensi sanatio haec facta est die 18 Junii 1856. Kutschker, *ib.*, p. 369.

vatio modo praescribitur, modo non praescribitur.[8] Feije, n. 775 ita scribit:[9] "Consensus ab una parte renovatio per se necessaria est, quando illa consensum initio non dedit *vel eum revocavit*; in reliquis vero casibus interdum non praescribitur, interdum praescribitur, praesertim si pars sanationem obtinens malae fidei fuit tempore celebrationis.[10] Consensus renovatio uni parti praescripta ad valorem requiritur; non praescripta utilis tamen est." Dicitur: *Vel eum revocavit*, i. e., ita retractavit, ut eum postea non amplius posuerit; prout scribit Gasparri, n. 1156: "Quodsi ab initio consensus adfuit, deinde revocatus est, sed postea rursum positus momento sanationis adest, sanatio in radice possibilis est." Idem etiam tenent Berardi: *Praxis Confess.*, ed. 3, n. 991; De Becker, p. 345.

Ex dictis sequitur etiam, consensus renovationem omnino requiri, si, non obstante impedimento dirimente ex. gr. affinitatis, una pars ficte contraxit aut cum *intentione*, licet solum mente retenta, non contrahendi obligationes substantiales matrimonii aut saltem unam ex ipsis, uti ex. gr. solum ineundi conjunctionem solubilem juxta vigentes leges civiles, aut duobus filiis genitis in usu matrimonii conceptionem impediendi, etc. Talis (dum alterius partis, quae ab initio matrimonium verum intendisse, at nunc de convalidatione matrimonii absque gravi incommodo moneri non posse supponitur, consensus sanatur in radice), *necessario* debet consensum conjugalem ponere eo modo ac si nunquam eum posuisset. Legitimatio prolis, si in casu requiritur, sufficienter fit per illius consensus sanationem in radice factam. Dico: *si in casu requiritur;* nam filii sunt legitimi, si procreantur ex matrimonio publice pro tali habito, licet una tantum pars illud contraxerit cum bona fide circa obstans impedimentum dirimens, dummodo id contractum fuerit coram parocho et testibus atque praemissis vel saltem dispensatis denunciationibus.[11]

[8] Gasparri, n. 1153.

[9] Cui consentit Aertnys, VI, 664.

[10] Seu, juxta De Becker, p. 348, si ejus consensus radicaliter nullus fuit. Ad vocem radicaliter se refert *le signalé sur l'imprimé* in sequenti adnotatione: "J'ai fait examiner ce travail du R. P. Putzer. On l'a trouvé correct. Un passage seulement a paru obscur: il est signalé sur l'imprimé. Monseigneur L. N. Begin, Archevêque de Québec."

[11] Konings, *Comp.*, n. 1546, 3°.

In aliis quibusdam casibus renovatio consensus pro sanatione in radice, ni praecipiendus, tamen consulendus est. Scribit Bucceroni:[12] "Si quis contrahit quidem *cum certitudine impedimenti*, sed dolens de impedimento, et non audens illud aperire, ne impediretur matrimonium vel ne infametur *aut* ex inadvertentia quadam *aut* cum aliquali dubitatione, quae admisceri solet putatae certitudini, controvertitur (scil. an valeat contractus qua matrimonialis). Probabilius valet matrimonium ob voluntatem praedominantem illud contrahendi. La Croix, n. 525. Attamen ad cautelam in praxi inducendus foret ad consensum renovandum. Sanchez, II, d. 33. Pontius, l. 4, c. 23." Ergo tales, ut praedictus, licet sciant impedimentum matrimonium annulans, consensum quidem sufficientem pro sanatione probabilius habent, attamen quia non omnino certus est, ut eum renovent consulitur. Idem dicendum erit in casibus similibus. Imo Kutschker, vol. V, p. 361, contendit, apud conjuges invalide conjunctos, si separati fuerint, et reconciliantur, consensus renovationem esse exigendam. Et quamvis in talibus casibus ea non stricte requiratur, utiliter tamen fit. Non enim praecise facienda est cum verbis Ritualis, "to have and to hold—for better for worse," sed fieri potest instructione de matrimonii obligationibus data partem monendo ad has iterum suscipiendas et exacte observandas; quibus si annuit consensum conjugalem jam renovavit.

3. In supplica pro validatione matrimonii in sua radice Romam (aut ad Episcopum) mittenda, praeter reliquas conditiones etiam (de valore) addendum est, num ab utraque vel una parte renovatio consensus peti possit.[13] Sufficit autem, ut id constet ex casus expositione, quin ejus specialis mentio fiat.[14]

4. Si S. Sedes requirit consensus renovationem, id fit in forma commissoria per rescriptum, cujus clausulae ab executore exacte servandae sunt. Episcopi eorumque subdelegati facultatem 6 Form. D exequentes id faciunt in forma gratiosa: vel personae praesenti vel supplicationi propositae eam immediate applicando. Ideo sanatio fit absque consensus renovatione, nisi haec ex quadam causa necessaria vel utilis reputaretur pro quadam persona

[12] *Theol. mor.*, II, n. 1033.
[13] Van de Burgt: *De disp. matr.*, n. 122.
[14] *Ib.*

praesente. Posset tamen Episcopus remittere casum quemdam ad subdelegatum sacerdotem cum instructionibus de consensu renovando, etc., et ita quasi commissoria potestate sibi delegata uti.

5. Quod jam ad quaestionem pertinet: an Jodocus debeat consensum renovare ad sanationem sui matrimonii obtinendam? responsio facile ex dictis de consensu primitus dato et perseverante deducitur. Cum Jodocus in Theologia de requisitis ad matrimonium fuerit perfecte eruditus, nonnisi mala fide contrahere potuit, certe sciens, matr. suum esse nullum. Ex hoc autem non concludas, Jodocum cum in nihilum tendere non potuerit, certe conjunctionem fornicariam iniisse. Re practice considerata nemo, qui non fictive tantum aut ludicre et ex joco agit, matrimonium invalidum *tanquam invalidum* appetit, sed non attendendo ad ejus validitatem aut hanc non credendo, tamen verum matrimonium vult, nisi exclusis bonis substantialibus matrimonii prorsus aliam conjunctionem intendit. Hoc jam sufficit, ut ex dictis patet. Ideo quidem utilis ei erit consensus renovatio, sed absolute necessaria dici forsan non poterit.

Resp. ad C. Supponitur, Maeviam catholicam quidem nomine, minime vero practice, religiosae educationi liberorum praefracte contradicere, et quaeritur: An hoc non obstet usui facultatis 6 Form. D, ubi pars, cujus consensus absque magno incommodo requiri nequit, "innoxia" sit oportet, ut possit fieri sanatio in radice. Non una est sententia de sensu hujus vocis. Contendit vir doctus Rev. P. A. Baart, S.T.L., LL.D.,[15] contra id, quod scripsi, innoxium in cit. Articulo idem significare ac innocens, inculpabile (guiltless), proferens exempli causa occultam affinitatem ex copula illicita, ubi evidenter magnum foret incommodum requirendi ex parte innocente renovationem consensus. At, quaeso, quid dicet vir egregius, si Caja sciret, Titium maritum suum, ante matrimonium copulam habuisse cum sua (Cajae) sorore, et sine dispensatione matrimonium contraxisse, nunc autem ob suam perversam indolem absque magno incommodo non posse induci ad renovationem consensus? Titius certe innocens non est. Num in hoc casu non poterit adhiberi sanatio in radice? Procul dubio poterit. Ergo ut pars, quae ad consensum

[15] THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, January, 1902, p. 71.

renovandum moveri non potest, innoxia sit, non est respiciendum ad ejus subjectivam dispositionem, sed unice ad hoc, an objective non noceat, *i.e.*, nocumentum non afferat vitae conjugali, comparti, proli: tale saltem quod compensari nequeat per aequale vel majus bonum. Quod nunc casum Maeviae attinet, dicendum erit, sanationem in radice vi Art. 6, Form. D, per se fieri non posse, cum non sit innoxia, sed damnum inferens educationi prolis. Attamen cum ex una parte difficile sit, matrem a filiis separare, si ex altera parte Jodocus, valetudine adepta, curam, quantum potest, adhibet ad prolem christiane educandam, ad Maeviae pravum influxum debilitandum ipsamque demum Ecclesiae catholicae reconciliandam, facile nocumentum ejus majori bono compensabitur, ut possit matrimonii per sanationem convalidatio fieri. Ita hoc etiam elucet ex Resp. S. Congr. de Prop. de 8 Mai. 1889 ad Ep. Bellevill. et Jun. 1892 ad Arch. Cincinnat.[16] necnon ex Resp. S.C.S. Off. 3 Jun. 1892[17] ad eundem.

Resp. ad D. Quomodo Jodoco relate ad matrimonium cum Maevia succurrendum?

Succurri ei potest:

(*a*) *per sanationem in radice*, supposito quod Missionarius subdelegationem tum ad sanationem juxta Art. 6, Form. D tum ad dispensationem vi Decreti *De Mandato* pro concubinariis moribundis (quae ei ad casum tantum ab Episcopo concedi potest), acceperit, et affinitas per copulam cum sorore Maeviae contracta occulta sit, nec aliud impedimentum accedat, quo *cumulatio*[18] fiat. Nam ex verbis facultatis sanatio fieri potest tantum si *unum* impedimentum dirimens (i. e., non cumulatum) obstat, cum indulta, non quidem specialissime, sed ordinarie nunc Episcopis una cum Formulis concedi solita *ad dispensandum* in cumulatis, non valeant ad sanandum in radice matrimonia.[19]

Notandum tamen, Missionarium, excepto casu, quo executor sit Episcopi dispensantis, procedere in praedictis non posse, nisi desit tempus ad Ordinarium recurrendi et periculum sit in mora.[20] Si sanatio fieri nequit, ei succurri potest:

[16] *Cfr.* THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, XVI, 543 et 672.
[17] *Ib.*, p. 670.
[18] THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, January, 1902, p. 11 (1).
[19] Putzer, *Comm. in fac. Ap.*, n. 15 et n. 95 ad VI.
[20] S. C. S. Off., 9 Jan. et 1 Mart. 1889.

(*b*) per dispensationem simplicem juxta Decretum *De Mandato* pro concubinariis moribundis emanatum 20 Febr. 1888[21] servatis omnibus, quae in eo praesertim quoad Diaconum praescribuntur (quod etiam valet in praecedenti) dummodo Missionarius facultatem ab Episcopo acceperit, periculum sit in mora et tempus desit ad Ordinarium recurrendi. Si tamen facultatem nullam habens ad hunc infirmum vocaretur et tempus deesset recurrendi ad Episcopum, proponere posset etiam casum cum omnibus circumstantiis Parocho, ut ipse dispensationem perageret. Supponitur enim parochus facultate praeditus, cum Episcopi parochos pro casibus ubi periculum in mora est et recursus ad ipsum fieri nequit, etiam habitualiter subdelegare possint.

Sed per dispensationem hanc Jodocus tantum habilis fit ad contrahendum. Matrimonium autem (cum susceptione Sacramenti) per mutuum consensum demum ab ipso et Maevia initur. Jam vero Maevia amens est. Quid nunc? Si lucida intervalla habet, res facilis erit. Per procuratorem Jodocus infirmus ei poterit dispensationem annunciare et ejus novum consensum petere. At quid, si Maevia absque lucidis intervallis tenebris amentiae esset immersa sine spe, fore, ut serius ocius sanaretur? Tum dispensatio esset inutilis, ideo omittenda.

Sed quid si Jodocus ex medicorum promissionibus contra spem speraret suam et Maeviae valetudinem atque graviter ex omissione dispensationis offenderetur, ut metuendum sit majus malum animae? *Resp.* In tali suppositione, si tempus desit recurrendi ad S. Sedem, lex ecclesiastica, praescribens consensus renovationem in utraque parte post dispensationem simplicem, evaderet damnosa et, licet irritans, cessaret obligare, prout hoc docent Doctores probati.[22] Ideo liceret eum ab impedimento dispensare, quo facto ejus consensus cum consensu Maeviae, qui matrimonialis fuisse ante eventum insaniae et perseverare censetur, unitus efficit validum et verum matrimonium.

[21] THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, 1891, Vol. II, p. 138.
[22] *Cfr.* M. De Luca: *Introd. gen.*, n. 120.

JOS. PUTZER, C.SS.R.

Ilchester, Md.

(Continuabitur.)

MISSA IN ALIENA ECCLESIA.

AT the beginning of the *Rubricae Generales Missalis Romani*, we read, "Missa quotidie dicitur secundum Ordinem officii," and at the end of Tit. IV, n. 3, "Quoad fieri potest, Missa cum Officio conveniat."

1. If a priest celebrates Mass in the church to which he is attached, this conformity of the Mass with the Office is easily obtained. But if he celebrates Mass in a church to which he is *not* attached, or if he is associated with no church, it may occur that the Office which he recites is not the Office of the church in which he celebrates. In such a case, to which Office must the Mass conform?—to his own Office or to that of the church in which he celebrates? The rubrics do not decide this question.

2. Before December 9, 1895, the celebrant was obliged to conform to the Office of the church in which he was celebrating: (*a*) when its Office was *ritus duplicis vel Dominicae aut aequivalentis*, which excluded Votive Masses, and its color was different from the color of his Office;[1] (*b*) when a feast was being celebrated *cum solemnitate et concursu populi*, even if the Office of the celebrant was 1ae or 2ae *classis*;[2] (*c*) when the celebrant recited the Office *de aliquo Beato*, whose feast was not found in the *Kalendarium* of the church;[3] (*d*) when the celebrant supplied the place of an absent or infirm parish priest "*in omnibus quae ad jura parochialia pertinent*, e.g., quaevis Missa cantata, Missa parochialis etsi lecta, exsequialis, nuptialis," etc., although his Office were a *duplex* 1ae or 2ae *classis*;[4] (*e*) when a priest celebrated the conventual Mass in the churches of nuns *quae ad chorum stricte sunt professae et totum officium canonicum recitant*, or in other churches in which there was an *obligatio chori*.[5]

3. Many inconveniences arose from these rules, especially for priests who were travelling, either on account of the privileges granted to individual churches or on account of the numberless new Masses in honor of the Saints or of the Blessed. To over-

[1] S. R. C., Nov. 12, 1831, n. 4669, ad 31.
[2] S. R. C., Jan. 29, 1752, n. 4223, ad 10 and 11.
[3] S. R. C., Decr. Gen., Sept. 27, 1659, n. 2002, ad 4.
[4] Wapelhorst, *Compendium S. Lit.*, § 36 d.
[5] *Ibidem*, e.

come all difficulties and to secure uniformity, the S. R. C. issued the following decree, which must be observed by all priests, secular or regular :

" Omnes et singuli Sacerdotes, tam Seculares, quam Regulares, ad Ecclesiam confluentes vel ad Oratorium publicum, Missas quum Sanctorum tum Beatorum, etsi Regularium proprias, *omnino* celebrent Officio eiusdem Ecclesiae vel Oratorii conformes, sive illae in Romano, sive in Regularium Missali contineantur ; exclusis tamen peculiaribus ritibus Ordinum propriis.

" Si vero in dicta Ecclesia, vel Oratorio, Officium ritus duplici inferioris agatur, unicuique ex Celebrantibus liberum sit Missam de requie peragere, vel votivam, vel etiam de occurrenti feria ; iis tamen exceptis diebus, in quibus praefatas Missas Rubricae Missalis Romani vel S. R. C. Decreta prohibent." [6]

4. What is meant by *Ecclesia* and *Oratorium publicum ?*

(*a*) By *Ecclesia* is meant all so-called Parish churches whether of *secular* priests in which the *ordo* of the diocese is observed, or of the *regular* clergy in which the *Kalendarium* proper of the society or congregation of either sex is followed.

(*b*) By *Oratorium publicum* is meant those oratories which by the authority of the Ordinary have been *perpetuo* blessed, dedicated, or solemnly consecrated for divine worship, which open on a street or road, or have free access from a public highway.[7]

There is no doubt that the celebrant must conform to the *ordo* of these churches and public oratories, *i. e.*, either to the *ordo* of the diocese or to that of religious orders if they have a proper *Kalendarium*.[8]

5. What about the *semi* or *quasi*-public oratories ? Semi-public oratories are such as have been erected by the authority of the Ordinary in places, in a certain manner private or at least not altogether public, yet not for the use of the public in general or for the benefit of an individual or of a family, but for the use of a community. In these Mass may be celebrated, and persons who

[6] Decretum Urbis et Orbis, July 9, 1895, n. 3862 ; confirmed by Leo XIII, Dec. 9, 1895.

[7] S. R. C., Jan. 23, 1899, n. 4007.

[8] In case the feast of the *Patronus loci* or of the Titular of such churches or public oratories is celebrated, the necessary changes according to the Rubrics must be made.

attend, thereby satisfy the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and holydays of obligation. Such are the *principal* chapels of ecclesiastical seminaries, colleges, religious communities, mission houses, retreat houses, hospitals, orphanages, prisons, homes for soldiers, marines, old persons, etc.; to which may be added chapels erected in cemeteries, provided admittance is granted not only to persons to whom such chapels belong, but also to other persons.[9] In these the *ordo loci* must also be observed.[10]

6. In the *Oratoria privata* "quae in privatis aedibus in commodum alicuius personae vel familiae ex indulto Sanctae Sedis erecta sunt,"[11] and in the *cappellae* or *oratoria* "*non principalia* Seminariorum, Collegiorum," etc.,[12] the celebrant *must* celebrate Mass conformably to his own *ordo*.

7. Who must conform to the *ordo loci* in churches and public and quasi-public oratories? All priests, whether secular or regular.[13] For Regulars a special decree was issued,[14] which ordains that, even though the color of their *ordo* agrees with the color of the *ordo loci*, they must conform to the *ordo loci* with regard to the Mass. The same must be said of the chaplain, secular or regular, of a public or quasi-public oratory,[15] appointed by the Ordinary, or of any other priest celebrating in said oratories.[16]

8. Hence according to the decree of July 9, 1895:

(*a*) All priests, secular or regular, must conform to the *ordo* of the church in which they celebrate, whether the Mass be *de Sancto*, common or proper, or even *de Beato*, provided that by indult such Mass is permitted to be celebrated.

(*b*) They must celebrate the Masses "*omnino* conformes Officio Ecclesiae vel oratorio." Hence—

1° they must disregard their own *ordo* altogether, even with regard to the Commemorations, Preface, and *Credo*;[17]

2° even when their *ordo* and the *ordo* of the church prescribe the Mass of the same saint, if this Mass is *proper* in

[9] S. R. C., Jan. 23, 1899, n. 4007.
[10] S. R. C., May 22, 1896, n. 3910.
[11] S. R. C., Jan. 23, 1899, n. 4007.
[12] S. R. C., May 22, 1896, n. 3910.
[13] S. R. C., July 9, 1895, n. 3862.
[14] S. R. C., Feb. 8, 1896, n. 3883.
[15] *Vide supra*, n. 5.
[16] S. R. C., June 27, 1893, n. 3919, ad XVII.
[17] S. R. C., June 3, 1896, n. 3924, ad III.

the church in which they celebrate, the *proper* must be selected, and *vice versa;*

3° this conformity extends even to the *oratio imperata* of the church in which they celebrate. They must totally disregard the *oratio imperata* of their own diocese.

N. B.—This conformity, however, does not extend to the peculiar rites of some religious orders, *e. g.*, of the Dominicans, etc.

9. This decree has force only when the Office of the church in which Mass is celebrated is a *duplex* or of a higher rite.

If it is *semiduplex* or of a lower rite any votive Mass or *Missa de Requie* may be celebrated; or if the celebrant wishes to follow his own *ordo*, the Mass may be celebrated according to it, but *more festivo* not *more votivo*. But in case there is an *oratio imperata* in the church in which he celebrates, it must be recited or omitted according to the rules of the *imperata*.

S. L. E.

THE MIND OF ROME IN CHURCH MUSIC.

THE Papal Commission on Church Music invites us to strenuous efforts towards introducing the traditional Roman chant into our churches.

To those whose judgment in matters of sacred music is directed by what might be called a Catholic instinct of the fitness of things relating to religious art, the wishes of the Holy See will appear in nowise over-exacting. The ancient mother of Christian Churches is never rigidly exclusive where the principles of truth or the sacredness of her trust are not directly involved. Yet none of us can be in doubt as to what she wishes us to aim at, and in this matter of the musical expression in the liturgical service she has spoken in unmistakable terms. Addressing the Abbot of Solesmes in an Apostolic Letter, May 19, 1901, the present Sovereign Pontiff, Leo XIII, writes:

"The Gregorian melodies were composed with the greatest skill and wisdom so as to interpret the sense of the words. They contain, if only they are properly rendered, great force, a marvellous blend of sweetness and solemnity, and a timely power, as they touch the soul of the listener, to awaken within him devout aspirations, and to nourish helpful thoughts."

That the admonition of the highest authority in the Church was heeded and resulted in definite activity on the part of those who were charged with the guardianship of the sacred functions is evident in many ways. Only a year ago the *Osservatore Romano* wrote:

"A marked improvement in the quality of the music heard at the *feste* has been observed since Cardinal Respighi has taken up the reins at the Vicariate. Cardinal Satolli is also working hard for the more general adoption of Plain Chant, and the choirmaster at St. John Lateran's understands his Eminence's mind on the subject so well that some part at least of the musical service is in Plain Chant whenever the Cardinal is present. His Eminence explained recently the principal difficulties in the way of the removal of bad music from the churches. 'First,' he said, 'the taste of the people has become vitiated; second, the rectors are often convinced that the churches would be deserted if the present florid music were replaced by the severe liturgical chant; and, third, the great body of choristers who make their livelihood by the present kind of music, and who are either unwilling or unable to adapt themselves to Plain Chant, must be reckoned with. But you may say we are making progress in the right direction in Rome.'"

With the approval of the Holy Father a Gregorian Institute was established last year in Freiburg University. The approval was warmly given, and moreover the Apostolic Benediction was imparted to Dr. Peter Wagner, professor of the history of music and of sacred music, in the same University. The course will embrace (*a*) the practice, execution, accompaniment, introduction to the direction of the Gregorian chant; and (*b*) the science, history, theory, and æsthetics of Gregorian chant, as well as introduction to the study of Gregorian manuscripts, and direction in scientific research regarding that chant.

Those who were interested in the movement making for reform in our Church music at the time when Cardinal Satolli acted as Apostolic Delegate to the United States, may recall his words on occasion of a festivity at the Church of the Paulist Fathers in New York. The chant of the Mass and Office in honor of the Patron Saint of the Order was Gregorian, partly harmonized, and rendered with exquisite precision, as is the custom in that church. The Cardinal took the opportunity of expressing his high appreciation of the character of the service, and among other things said: "May it please Almighty God that such edifying singing could be heard in all the churches of this country. Any effort made for this purpose would certainly meet with the approval

of the Holy Father, who has always taken so much interest in the use of the Gregorian music; and it would bring down the blessings of God, to whose House the plain chant is so truly becoming."

Still there is Gregorian and Gregorian, as the Holy Father suggests; and it is quite possible to conform to the letter of the prescriptions of the Papal Commission on Church Music, while at the same time scandalizing the Church by the imperfect manner in which the chant is rendered. Those who sing the Gregorian music without having a proper comprehension as to the value of the notes, the necessity of observing accurate time, of natural phrasing and just emphasis, are apt to disgust the hearer, and make a penance of what the Church means to be a most holy pleasure.

So, then, not all is done when plain chant is allowed its proper place. Some of us have heard it sung, even in France, in a fashion which caused Carlyle, no doubt rudely, to style the sacred service "Mass brayings." These things ought not so to be.

However they are not so, in many places. And, as has been said, the Church is always there encouraging the use of plain chant; and the Pope is about to speak again even more authoritatively in its favor, so all understand. And from several countries come words of encouragement from those in high places. Every one knows what Germany has done. And in France—to take one instance—the Archbishop of Rouen has lately directed all the superiors of seminaries and of ecclesiastical schools in his diocese to make plain chant a compulsory subject of study, counting at the examinations and in competitions for prizes. It is only fitting here to recall once more the Third Council of Baltimore's decree, that it was most desirable that the rudiments of Gregorian chant should be taught in the primary school so that by degrees the greater part of the people could take part in the choral services of the Church.[1]

[1] This is quoted in the preface, with the Archbishop of Dublin's *imprimatur*, of the English Catholic Truth Society's "*Church Music: Series No. 1*, a Gregorian Mass for solemn feasts," and it is alluded to again by at least one American Bishop lately when deploring the irreligion cultivated by neglect of its sacred injunctions. Thousands of Masses, etc., conformable to rule are given in the *Guide to Catholic*

In England, last St. Cecilia's Day marked a great step in advance—at Oscott, now the important seminary of so many dioceses, in whose studious cloister's pale was first heard the thrilling wonder of Newman's *Second Spring*, whose—

> "Music dwells,
> Wandering and lingering on as loth to die,
> Like sounds whose very sweetness yieldeth proof
> That they were born for immortality."

I quote from *The Tablet* (London):

"Palestrina, Vittoria, Croce, Casciolini! How refreshing to the ear wearied by the sensuous trivialities of our 'operatic' composers. Here, indeed, was *Church* music, adequately rendered, and free from every taint of the concert-room. *Is it not the case in too many of our churches that one has only to listen with closed eyes in order to forget that one is in church at all? Such a state of things is impossible at Oscott.* Whatever varied opinions may be held respecting the merits of the music or its composers, one thing is incontrovertible, viz., that it can never be mistaken for anything but what it professes to be—*Church* music, entirely free from secular associations. *The most hopeful sign for the future of our Church music is the attention which it is receiving in our seminaries and schools.*"

Mr. Gatty, well known as a writer on Church art, editor with the Duke of Norfolk of the *Arundel Hymn Book*, and now at work publishing a collection of Church music of old composers, adds these happy words in the same number of the *Tablet* (December 7, 1901):

"We seem to be entering upon a new life, full of such rich promise, that I hardly dare trust myself to speculate what another ten years may not do in the matter of Catholic Church music in England. The tedious controversy as to styles may be thrown to the dogs, for beneath the historic and hospitable roof of Oscott College on St. Cecilia's Day representatives of the old school of operatic church music, and of the still older school of Palestrina church music, mingled together, and agreed without dispute that the music sung by the seminarists was on the very highest plane possible.

"For once in a way, one heard a Catholic choir perform music devotional, intellectual, and well within the compass and capacity of the singers. The devotional character of the music was secured by its being chosen from the works of composers who wrote themes to enhance the power of the words upon the soul, and not to give

Church Music (Fischer, Pustet, Herder, Benziger. $1.00), by order of the First Provincial Council of Milwaukee and St. Paul, with preface by Bishop Marty. And lately the Cincinnati Diocesan Commission has issued a *Second Official Catalogue of Church Music*, which gives hundreds of compositions accepted and approved, together with versions for rejecting others, following the Roman decrees.

opportunity for the best voices in the Grand Duke's stud of opera singers. The high value of association was mingled with it, the aroma of ancient fanes and hallowed traditions.

"The intellectual character was secured by the music being selected from works of great men, who really did *compose* what they wrote, planned it, gave it shape and form, built it gradually up out of simple elements, and developed it from stage to stage, until the whole complex edifice culminates in a splendid climax of form and tone.

"If these traditions be nobly persevered in at Oscott, and if the Cathedral choir at Westminster, under Mr. Terry's admirable tuition, raise the standard and hold it aloft, and Downside be true to its colors, and Mr. Barclay continue to give us more and more of Palestrina and Byrd, then we may hope to wean the general public from trash, and Catholic singers from the fatal illusion that because they can sing 'I stood on the bridge at midnight,' they are equally competent to mutilate Mozart and Cherubini."

II.

The sad letter of a priest in the same paper a few years ago is now out of date. He plainly stated that in his seminary jeers and sneers at the Church's plain chant had been the rule among her young scholastics and priests. And those who so talk and act are far from choosing even the most suitable music not Gregorian. Rather, they are those who feelingly persuade us that indeed the Church is suffering in her own sanctuaries. Are the words and suggestions and implorings of the Pope and Congregations uncalled for, when in France a good curé, once professor at a notable college, posted up in his church porch last year the names of two grand opera artists, and the *morceaux* they were to sing; in a church where the summer visitors' young daughters, too, used to come in with their violins to Benediction, and replace *Laudate Dominum* with various little sentimental tunes to French words? That seems sad in the France of to-day, when surely the Church needs to show herself in her strength, in her awful seriousness, and with the noblest gratification of the great and deep yearnings of mind and soul that are in the men around her there; quick in wit as they are hard in brain; too proud, too vain, but strangely, as ever since she appeared on earth, bowed and softened, restrained and satisfied, by her whose measure of their lives is the Cross of Christ.

"By Thy nativity, by Thy dereliction!" It is the strongest who know their own nothingness, before that other Strength that emptied Itself. But false devotion and bad art, the unreality of

the weaker brethren and sisters, without the humility; showiness, rather than the hidden life,—these are poor weapons of defence, and the Church can trust little to them. To illustrate further this contrast to what the Church desires, and to what her rulers are pressing forward to in fact, pass into America and we hear in "Irish" churches, for instance, the national airs of Ireland; though the Church of Ireland and of all men has reminded us how unsuitable they are there. Descendants of Irishmen think they are honoring Ireland by what is really un-Irish Catholicism. May an Irishman make to them this appeal:—to note how a well-known priest in Ireland, one who has blessed many by his writings, on both sides of the Atlantic, yet said he would judge "every day spent out of Ireland one day lost out of his life." Is that patriot enough? When he heard of a performance last year in a Chicago church, he wrote: "Thank God, here in this country-place we have no knowledge of such things. I myself jumped literally off the chair at 'Believe me if all those endearing charms.'"

And another, who is from All Hallows College, Dublin, where the Archbishop and his Coadjutor are champions for the Church in this respect, and encourage in the College the better and truly religious music, transporting its young missionaries into a world in keeping with all ardor for God and for souls,—this faithful Irish priest has described his astonishment when, on his first St. Patrick's Day in America, he heard the "Minstrel boy to the war is gone," as he went from the altar, and—perhaps when already in the sacristy—"Come back to Erin." "I shan't hear it again," was his remark; "I told the organist what I thought of it;" which we respectfully commend to organists who wish to be more Irish than the Irish.

But neither need they fall to that sentimental Protestantism, "Nearer, my God, to Thee,"[2] nor to that worse sentimentality of

[2] The *Catholic News*, of New York, lately protested against the defence, by an ostensibly Catholic paper, of the use of this hymn. "We are tired of remonstrating. Until we saw it publicly defended, we just docketed its use with other accounts of breaches of the laws of the Church." The Church suffers. She knows how wise she is in making light of the hymnology of passing emotions. This priest from Ireland said that the names of singers in *Catholic* churches at least are not given in the papers. And, indeed, poor old ex-Catholic St. Patrick's, Dublin, even in the

"Rousseau's Dream." Are those fit tunes for Catholic cathedral bells, wherewith to call to Mass the children of those robust Catholics who walked their miles to Mass, "to be where Jesus Christ is;" as one of them, unlettered, said to her little son, now a bishop.

III.

However, the greater mistake is to be more "Catholic" than the Church, worse than being more Irish than the Irish. Some priest reformers and editors seem to blame pastors for "attempting to import into the Church of God the music of the theatre, under the plea that what is pleasing in the theatre cannot be displeasing in the church;" and they truly add: "Devotionalism is of an entirely different paternity from emotionalism, and the thought and feelings that are awakened by sensuous music are not the ones that do honor to the service of God." To hear that is certainly

irreverent days when it would have been called "Paddy's opera," kept outward decency enough—true Catholic taste enough—not to publish the names of the performers.

But here are some notes from the *Montreal Star* of the Saturday before last Christmas. They are simply the exact words of what the churches there in communion with the Holy See allowed to be said about themselves, as "drawing houses."

Every "solo," "duet," "trio," and "quartette," is mentioned; in one church the names of thirty performers are given; in another both clerical and lay names. It would be thought "showing off," almost, on a concert programme. "First performances" are duly chronicled; and the whole is called, indeed, a "programme," or a "splendid programme." There is "entrée," or "opening of the services," such and such instrumental or vocal selections. There is "sortie," or "postludi"—one a "Grand March" from an opera by Meyerbeer—or there is a "finale." And then an advertisement that "the same programme will be repeated" at such and such a *Mass*.

One "composition is said to be of a very high character"; and then "one of Professor D——'s highest pupils" will play "a 'cello obligato." Afterwards, "a quaint musical production will be rendered in a *Tantum Ergo*." "At the Communion, Mr. P. F. of the Conservatory of Paris will contribute a violin solo."

At another church it is the eye rather that is promised pleasure. "The ceremonies will be most elaborate. . . . The decorations of the . . . altar will be a special feature."

And another "promises to eclipse any musical service," etc.

The Protestant churches were eclipsed, most of them giving their soloists' names and nothing more; the Church of England as a rule not giving even those. Thus it came nearest to the Pope and his English Bishops. *Adsit omen.*

to hear the Church. But are pastors to blame as much as those who manage priest and people; that is, the irresponsible laity of organ-bench and choir? The *fons et origo mali* is their independence from priestly control. And why are they independent? Are the priests in a position to guide them? If they are not,—why? Anyway, there will soon be more in some countries who will be so fitted. And then the Church may enjoy her own again.

A second error of reformers is to rush to extremes, from Irish melodies or Italian operas all of a leap to St. Gregory, not to say St. Ambrose. Now this is a source of great difficulties. It makes people shy of all reform, makes them material if not formal rebels against the Church's laws; which thing is serious. It is nevertheless a fact that they are in rebellion. For I suppose it is hardly necessary to notice the hinted objection that these are the laws of the Congregations merely; what priest would think of disregarding frequently and persistently their laws as to rubrics?

When we keep to the abuses, then, to operas, drawing-room songs, and national melodies, we are really opposing Rome. But we can obey her, and yet not go beyond her generous injunctions. This is really a simpler matter to begin with than many seem to imagine. Here is no question of differing style and tastes, of more or less suitably difficult music; there is no room for discussion at all. Every Catholic church choir could obey its priest to-morrow if he were to enforce these simple Roman rules: (1) no drawing-room airs, such as the "Lost Chord" of Sullivan, or Mendelssohn's "Forest" part song, or "Home, Sweet Home;" (2) no national airs; and so no hearing, at Mass, of "Thou wouldst still be adored, as this moment Thou art, let thy loveliness fade as it will;" (3) no operas, either Donizetti or Wagner; (4) no repetition by the choir of the words *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, and *Credo in unum Deum;* (5) no changing of the slightest word in the sacred text; therefore no Rosewig's *Miserere nobis* (twice), adding *dona nobis pacem* (5 times), *Agnus Dei* being omitted; and no Wiegand's "*Agnus Dei, Dominus Deus, Filius Patris.*"

A Jesuit Father says he heard "genitum non factum, factum non genitum." Certainly the present writer heard—in a cathedral, with the Bishop celebrating in unconscious devotion—the

Nicene Creed without the *Filioque*, during the flighty absurdities (for the sanctuary) of Kalliwoda in A. The venerable Archbishop of Cincinnati has not hesitated to say to his clergy: "*How far we may be excused for having hitherto suffered inadvertently such alterations to be made in our churches is for God to judge. But now . . . it would certainly be a sin, mortal or venial, as the case might be, to make use of these mutilated compositions in the sacred functions.*" [3]

Another rule (6) forbids leaving out the Proper of the Mass, which can be recited in monotone at least; and another (7) forbids suppressing the Proper Psalms, Hymns, and Antiphons of Vespers.

Having thus been obedient to the letter of the law, we may surely show a more filial temper than that, and may try to enter

[3] It is no wonder then that the Church is so profoundly solicitous as to the character and execution of the music which accompanies the liturgy. The words are her own; nay, the words are in most cases the words of the Holy Spirit Himself. They are words directly connected with the most solemn worship. Therefore it is the words, and not the music, which are her first concern. To bring out those blessed words with befitting intelligence and meaning, the music must be grave, stately, sweet, and devotional. *No associations of worldliness and frivolity must enter the Church. The Church's ministers are charged with this responsibility.* The executants are responsible also. To sing the chant of the Mass is an act of belief, of reverence, and of worship. To make it a distraction to the people present, or an occasion for mere artistic display, is to insult the presence of God and the holy angels who guard that Presence. "Sing ye wisely," said the Psalmist of old (Ps. 46: 8). Let the meaning of those liturgical words be studied, and their connection with the Blessed Eucharist; and then the singing of the choir becomes for singers and for assistants alike a series of acts of devotion. How much is lost by not understanding better! Is there anything more touching than the words of the liturgy on a great festival? What emotion is awakened when, on Christmas Day, after the words of St. Paul have been simply chanted by the subdeacon, describing the prophetic announcement of Christ's coming, the whole choir rise, as the single voice dies away, and in sweet unison, with simple modulations, respond with that "verbum caro factum est"—those lyrical strophes of Scriptural words more penetrating than any chorus of Greek tragedy? What does not the devout heart feel on Easter Sunday when the choir, as the ministers ascend to the altar, cry out together: "The Lord is great, and greatly to be praised; the Lord is great and great His might?" Or, on Ascension Day, when the low sweet strains of the "viri Galilaei"—angelic words—hush the people into attention as the solemn Mass begins? "Sing ye wisely." Let us try to understand. (*Praise and Worship*, a sermon preached in Middlesborough Cathedral at the dedication of the organ, September 15, 1889, by Bishop Hedley, O.S.B. Republished in *The Christian Inheritance.*)

into the Church's spirit. Obligation is one thing; counsel, another. But still let us be generous with Rome, nor seek to be nearer the Divine Mind than she. Does she feel happy in her children when women sing solos at Benediction, such as Coleridge condemned as even unnatural:

> "When the long-breathed singer's uptrill'd strain
> Bursts in a squall"?

Or, again, is it reverent to see the holy Mass waiting for the "Amen" chorus to Haydn's second *Credo*?

> "In notes with many a winding bout
> Of linked sweetness long drawn out,
> With wanton heed and giddy cunning,
> The melting voice through mazes running"?

It is beautiful, just as the *seasons* are. It is the same music; you hear it, as if a fine band in the street interrupted some holy office; and then you go back to your prayers. But is the Church happier in her children?

Mr. Terry, formerly the Downside choirmaster, and now organist of the great Cathedral in London, has said that a man wishing to judge with the Church sees discussion after discussion and writers on Church music end as they began, by disagreeing, and so he falls "helplessly back on the dictum that, after all, the whole thing is only a matter of opinion." Now that is just what I wish to deny most emphatically. It is *not* a matter of opinion. It is a question of principles. What then are these principles? Let us apply the touchstone of a few simple questions.

To choirmasters I would say:

1. Does your composer's treatment of the words obey the rules laid down by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, or does he alter, omit, or unnecessarily repeat them? If he does the latter, you must reject his music, be it ever so good otherwise.

2. Do the various movements impede the progress of the service, and (in the case of a Mass) keep the priest waiting at the altar? If so, and the music will not permit of convenient "cuts," your duty is to reject it *en bloc*.

3. Is your music any adaptation from something with well-known secular associations? Good taste alone, to say nothing of ordinary reverence, would suggest its rejection.

4. Does the music demand greater vocal and instrumental resources than you have at your disposal? In that case leave it alone.

Now for one or two more searching tests.

5. Does the style of your music tend to produce in your singers an attitude of reverence, or does it foster a spirit of self-importance and love of display? If it does the latter, be sure you are working on the wrong lines.

6. Does it so subordinate itself to the liturgy as to draw the thoughts of the worshipers towards the ritual act in progress, rather than to itself, as something apart from or merely synchronous with them? Does it enchain their attention to the detriment of their prayers, or does it assist their devotions? In the answer to this question, as well as to the previous two, there is room for considerable difference of opinion. In that case you have a triumphantly infallible rule for your guidance, it is this: *Give the Church the benefit of the doubt.* Do not bring into her services any music (no matter how much you may love it) if you have the faintest suspicion that it may produce any of the ill effects I have named. There is abundance of music about whose liturgical and devotional fitness there can be no possible doubt. Choose from that; let the music you thus provide be a perfect gift, not a doubtful offering.

Lastly (7), Does your style of music tend to create (either in choir or congregation) a distaste for the authorized plain chant of the Church? Does it—worst of all—oust plain chant from your services altogether? Whether we like it or dislike it, we cannot get away from the fact that it is the Church's authorized song, and that where its rendering is possible the omission of Introit, Gradual, etc., is indefensible. One often hears expressions of regret from the clergy that they never hear the Proper of the Mass from one year's end to another, because their choirs cannot or will not make a proper study of plain chant."

IV.

The basis of our work must be the Plain Chant. Let no one decide about it without knowing what it may really be like, and

without facing the fact of the position the Church gives it. This much she claims from us; this is of obligation. And yet a priest preaching in Chicago last November, when the so-called "Mozart's Twelfth" was performed, had to say to the Catholic people, of "the Gregorian chant in music, which is made to conform with the movements of the priest at the altar, and which is the grand old music of the Church," that "we scarcely know it to-day."

If so, we are almost behind the world. As says the preface to the already quoted C. T. S. *Church Music* series (No. 1, p. v): "Musicians of the highest rank, Protestant as well as Catholic, have expressed their admiration of it, and of its suitability for its sacred purpose." A writer in the *Berlin Musikzeitung* aptly summarizes the views of those eminent authorities, when he says: "From an artistic point of view we must acknowledge that in the Gregorian chant, for all its simplicity and sameness, which are only consistent with its ecclesiastical character, there is yet found a great variety; and what is more, that the melodies are the most faithful representations of the sense of the words; so that both text and melody together form a perfect unity, as though cast in one mould. . . . The highest office of music is this,—to express in sound the feelings of the heart, and to awaken like feelings in the hearts of those who hear it; and this task is fully accomplished by the Gregorian chant. Its intrinsic worth will always be avowed by every real judge of music . . . Of course, one who seeks and finds the summit of musical art in *bravura arias* will scarcely enjoy Gregorian. But any one who without prejudice considers the intrinsic essence of music, and its end and object in its religious and ecclesiastical phase, will be forced to grant that the Gregorian chant stands unparalleled."

An echo comes from America, hoping to be Catholic and Roman:

"The time is opportune at the beginning of the new century for the publication in the United States of missals and vesper books for the laity. *It is a remarkable fact that in our religious schools, colleges, and kindred p'aces of education the treasures of liturgy are almost unknown.* The unfolding of this knowledge to pupils is destined to be beneficial in the extreme, and will attract to the Church by its abiding and wholesome culture countless converts of an upright, intellectual type. Then operatic soloists and figured music shall not be tolerated in the house of God, and

Gregorian and Ambrosian chants will resound throughout this Christian land."—*New York Freeman's Journal.*

Again another voice from amongst us:

"The Catholic American of to-day is like a voyager among the beautiful coral reefs; he must often drop his sounding line. The tide of immigration brings thousands of Catholics to our shores; but, either they leave their traditions of fasts and feasts behind them, or forget them on coming among new scenes; and there is not one festival or solemnity of their religion which would not fail of its essential characteristic as to circumstances, but for that liturgy, which is like the pilot at the helm, not only of the Church, but of Christian society. *The sorrow and the mortification is that so few Catholics take the trouble to understand this liturgy or to enter into its spirit.* For most people, it is enough that the ceremonies of the Church go on, and that they attend upon those of obligation; but as to any curiosity concerning the meaning of these ceremonies, it seems hardly to exist. Only when an unusual representation or symbol is presented some memory is revived of the beautiful old Catholic countries from which they have come, in pursuit of wealth or of competency, to find themselves stripped of everything pertaining to their glorious old faith, but its creed.

Dr. William Barry's article in the *National Review*[4] excited much interest. "The Prospects of Catholicism" are bright in the intellectual world; at least the prospects of the olden Protestantism are dark, are nothing. And as to the weakness, or the foolishness, it may be, of the defenders of the truth, that is an incident of their humanity. Such difficulties are the difficulties of all our imperfect existence; but the difficulties of Anglicanism, for instance, are those which insult your reason within its lawful limited ground. And yet this priest had to add: "*Perhaps the saddest of all sights in this melancholy world is the mishandling, worse than neglect, of our Catholic treasures, our ceremonies, music, architecture, our philosophies and our devotions,* by those who should watch over them as at the gate of Heaven. Reformation is always called for, now as in more scandalous times, and in no slight degree."

May the good priest and scholar have less and less cause to say that. He will, if we hearken to Rome. For, as the Blessed Thomas More said, when the world round him was full of its pretexts for going *Los von Rom:* "I could not well devise better provisions than are by the laws of the Church provided already, if they were as well kept as they be well provided."

W. F. P. Stockley.

Fredericton, N. B., Canada.

[4] November, 1901.

Analecta.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE PROPAGANDAE FIDEI.

I.

ABSTINEANT ORDINARII LOCORUM S. C. DE PROP. FIDE SUBIECTORUM A LICENTIA DANDA RELIGIOSIS INSTITUTIS NOVAM DOMUM APERIENDI, ABSQUE VENIA PRIUS A S. C. OBTENTA.

Ill.me ac R.me Domine:

Quamvis probe sciat haec S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, ingentem provenire missionibus utilitatem ex ministerio Regularium: uti ut maxime in votis sit videre eorum domus ubique institui: curandum tamen est, ut res ordinate et ad praestitutae disciplinae normam peragantur. Quamobrem duxit S. Congregatio per praesentes litteras in memoriam Ordinariorum locorum a se dependentium revocare sententiam, quam ut communem hodie et cui favet passim rerum iudicatarum auctoritas, tradit Constitutio SS.mi D. N. Leonis XIII, quae incipit "Romanos Pontifices": nempe: non licere Regularibus, tam intra quam extra Italiam, nova monasteria aut conventus sive collegia fundare, sola Episcopi venia, sed indultam quoque a Sede Apostolica

facultatem requiri. Cui legi cum aut semper aut ubique obtemperatum non fuisse videatur, ideo eius observantiam voluit S. Congregatio per praesentes urgere. Diligenter ergo in posterum abstineant Ordinarii omnes Sacrae Congregationi subiecti a licentia danda religiosis Institutis domum aperiendi in territorio propriae iurisdictionis, absque venia prius a praefata S. Congregatione obtenta. Quod vero attinet ad domus religiosas huc usque in iisdem territoriis, S. Congregatione inconsulta, forte erectas, etsi haec, Ordinariis flagitantibus, singulisque ponderatis casibus, propensa omnino sit ad legitimas habendas huiusmodi fundationes: tamen mandat ut de praedictis si quae existant domibus, distinctus ab Ordinariis exhibeatur elenchus, ac simul pro iisdem canonica ratihabitio per supplicem libellum petatur.

Interim Deum precor ut Te diu sospitet.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus S. C. de Propaganda Fide die 7 Decembris 1901.

Amplitudinis Tuae

Addictissimus Servus
MIECISLAUS *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI, *Praefectus.*
ALOYSIUS VECCIA, *Secretarius.*

II.

CONNAVIGANTIUM CONFESSIONES AUDIRE VALENT MISSIONARII INSUL. CAROLINARUM AD CONFESSIONES ADPROBATI A SUIS SUPERIORIBUS LICET TITULO PRAEF. AP. NON INSIGNITIS, SED IURIS DICTIONEM SEPARATAM HABENTIBUS.

Rev.mo P. Ministro Generale dei Cappuccini.

Con biglietto del 3 u. p. Agosto n. 45431, relativo ad alcuni dubbî proposti dalla P. V. R.ma a nome dei missionarî delle Isole Caroline, il sottoscritto Segretario della S. C. di Propaganda comunicavale essere stato deferito alla Suprema Cong.ne del S. Officio il seguente dubbio proposto dalla P. V. R.ma: Se nel decreto della Suprema in data 9 Aprile 1900 intorno alla facoltà di ascoltare in mare le confessioni dei naviganti per parte dei sacerdoti connaviganti autorizzati a confessare dai proprî Ordinarî, si dovessero intendere compresi anche i sacerdoti autorizzati ad

ascoltare le confessioni dai Superiori delle Caroline sia Orientali sia Occidentali, i quali non hanno il titolo di Prefetti, benchè abbiano peraltro giurisdizione con territorio separato. — Da recente comunicazione di quel R.mo Mgr. Commissario, lo scrivente apprende che riferitasi la cosa nella Con.gne di fer. IV 13 corr. gli E.mi Inquisitori Gen.li hanno con approvazione del S. Padre emanato il seguente decreto: "In casu comprehendi."

Tanto il sottoscritto si reca a premura di portare a notizia della P. V. R.ma; e con sensi di alta stima si rafferma

Di V. P. R.

Dev.mo Servo

LUIGI VECCIA, *Segretario.*

E S. R. ET U. INQUISITIONIS.

I.

DECRETUM.

SUPERIORES REGULARES NULLO UNQUAM MODO COGNOSCERE POSSUNT CAUSAS SUORUM SUBDITORUM AD S. OFFICIUM SPECTANTES.

Feria IV, die 15 Maii 1901.

In Congregatione Generali Sacrae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis, Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Domini Cardinales in rebus Fidei et morum Inquisitores Generales sequens tulere Decretum: Uti pluries a Summis Pontificibus sancitum est, in rebus ad S. Officium spectantibus nullo modo ad Superiores Regulares pertinere subditorum suorum causas agnoscere, nulloque proinde titulo aut praetextu posse vel debere, nisi de expresso S. Congregationis mandato, de his inquirere, denunciationes recipere, testes interrogare, reos excutere, iudicium instituere, sententiam ferre aut alia quavis ratione vel modo in eis sese immiscere vel manus apponere; sed quos Religiosi Viri ex suis subditis vel confratribus vel etiam superioribus huiusmodi criminum, (praesertim quod ad abusum Sacramentalis Confessionis spectat) reos vel suspectos noverint, strictim teneri, absque ulla cum aliis quibuscumque communicatione, nulla petita venia, nullaque fraterna correptione aut monitione praemissa, eos S. Officio

aut locorum Ordinariis incunctanter denuntiare. Ne vero sanctissimae hae leges ex ignorantia (quod Deus avertat) negligi aut infringi contingat, Superioribus grave onus incumbere eas, quo opportuniori putaverint modo, ad subditorum suorum certam et distinctam identidem deferre notitiam earumque ab eis plenam observantiam urgere.

Quae omnia Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Divina Providentia Papa XIII, in audientia R. P. D. Commissario Generali die 17 eiusdem mensis et anni impertita, benigne adprobare et confirmare dignatus est.

L. ✝ S. I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. I. Not.*

II.

OB PERICULUM MORBI, VALIDE ET LICITE LICET BAPTIZARE CUM AQUA PERMIXTA SOLUTIONE MILLESIMAE PARTIS BICHLORATI HYDRARGYRICI.

Beatissime Pater:

Archiepiscopus Ultraiectensis, ad Sanctitatis Vestrae pedes provolutus, humiliter exponit quae sequuntur.

Plures medici in nosocomiis, aut alibi casu necessitatis infantes, praecipue in utero matris, baptizare solent aqua cum hydrargyro bichlorato corrosivo (Gallice: chloride de mercure) permixta. Componitur fere haec aqua solutione unius partis huius chlorati hydrargyrici in mille partibus aquae; eaque solutione aquae potio venefica est. Ratio autem cur hac mixtura utantur est, ne matris uterus morbo afficiatur.

Quae quum ita sint, pro maiori rei gravissimae securitate, Sanctitatem Vestram enixe rogo, ut haec dubia solvere dignetur:

I. Estne Baptisma cum huiusmodi aqua administratum certo, an dubie validum?

II. Estne licitum, ad omne morbi periculum vitandum, huiusmodi aqua Sacramentum Baptismatis administrare?

III. Licetne etiam tum hac aqua uti, quando sine ullo morbi periculo aqua pura adhiberi potest?

Feria IV, 21 Augusti 1901,

In Cong.ne Gen.li habita ab E.mis ac R.mis DD. Card. Inquisitoribus, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. DD. CC. S. Officii voto, iidem E.mi D.ni respondendum censuerunt:

Ad I. *Providebitur in II.*

Ad II. *Licere, ubi verum adest morbi periculum.*

Ad III. *Negative.*

In sequenti vero feria VI, die 23 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia R. P. D. Commissario S. O. impertita, SS.mus D. N. Leo Div. Prov. PP. XIII, audita de omnibus et singulis praemissis relatione, responsiones E.morum Patrum confirmavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

MINISTER ASSISTENS MISSAE CUM CANTU JUXTA DECRET. 3377, DEBET ESSE IN SACRIS, SI DEBEAT ETIAM CALICEM ABSTERGERE.

R.mus D.mus Episcopus Plocensis Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi sequens dubium, pro opportuna solutione, humillime proposuit, super ministro, qui, iuxta decretum 3377. *Baionem.*, 25 Septembris 1875, in Missis cum cantu sine ministris folia vertit, Calicem discooperit, ipsumque mundat, vinum et aquam infundit, eumdemque Calicem infra actionem palla cooperit et discooperit, iuxta opportunitatem, nec non ipsum tergit post Communionem suisque ornamentis instruit, nimirum: Utrum iste minister debeat esse in Sacris constitutus?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum censuit: "*Affirmative*, si debeat etiam Calicem abstergere."

Atque ita rescripsit, die 6 Decembris 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

IN PROCESSIONIBUS NEQUEUNT MULIERES INCEDERE INTER CONFRATERNITATES ET CLERUM, POSSUNT TAMEN, EXTRA ECCLESIAM, SEQUI STATUAM ET CANERE, QUANDO CLERUS TACET.

Hodiernus Pro-Vicarius Generalis R.mi D.ni Episcopi Valven. et Sulmonen., de consensu sui Antistitis, Sacrorum Rituum Con-

gregationi humiliter exposuit, aliquibus in locis, in publicis et sacris processionibus, post Confraternitates laicales, proprium saccum indutas, incedere quamplurimas mulieres, iuvenculas praesertim, binas, canentes carmina vernacula lingua, at postea clerum. Hinc idem R.mus Orator sequentia proposuit dubia solvenda; nimirum:

I. An huiusmodi usus permitti possit?

II. Et quatenus negative ad primum, an saltem possit permitti, ut mulieres incedant immediate post statuam B. Mariae Virginis vel alicuius Sancti, et canant quando clerus tacet?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum esse censuit:

Ad I. *Negative.*

Ad II. *Affirmative* ad primam partem, et *Affirmative* etiam ad secundam in processione tantum et non intra Ecclesiam.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 29 Novembris 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. † S. †D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

TRIA SOLVUNTUR DUBIA.

R.mus D.nus Henricus Sauvé, Canonicus et Magister Caeremoniarum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Vallis Vidonis, de consensu R.mi sui Episcopi, humillime petiit, ut a Sacra Rituum Congregatione insequentia dubia benigne solvantur, et nimirum:

I. Utrum Missa votiva de Sacro Corde Iesu, per decretum *Urbis et Orbis*, diei 28 Iunii 1889, indulta, dici possit Feria VI, quae prima in Ianuario mense occurrit, quando in illam diem incidit Vigilia Epiphaniae?

II. Utrum in Vesperis coram SS. Sacramento exposito cantatis debeat Hebdomadarius a principio induere stolam, ratione incensationis SS. Sacramenti ad *Magnificat* faciendae; et quatenus negative, utrum debeat saltem ad *Magnificat?*

III. Utrum Dominica III Adventus, et Dominica IV Quadragesimae paramenta coloris rosacei adhiberi possint non tantum in

Missa solemni, sed etiam in Missis privatis et in Officio de Dominica?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque mature perpensis, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Negative.*

Ad II. Stetur Rubricis et Decretis.

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Atque ita rescripsit, die 22 Novembris 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

IV.

LITANIAE LAURETANAE CANTARI POSSUNT PER TRINAS INVOCATIONES, POPULO QUARTAM RESPONDENTE.

A Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione expostulatum est: Utrum in sacris functionibus, quae ut plurimum horis vespertinis fiunt in Ecclesiis vel Oratoriis publicis cum expositione Ss.mi Eucharistiae Sacramenti, liceat, uti mos est antiquus in pluribus Ecclesiis etiam Urbis, cantare Litanias B. M. V. Lauretanas per trinas invocationes, respondente quartam fideli plebe; atque ita ex ordine explere ultimam Invocationem *Regina Sacratissimi Rosarii, Ora pro nobis?*

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, respondendum esse censuit: *Affirmative.*

Atque ita rescripsit, die 6 Decembris 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

Conferences.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE PROPAGANDA:

1. Ordains that Bishops of localities subject to the Propaganda are not to allow the foundation of new religious houses within their jurisdiction. The application is to be made to the Holy See through the Bishop.
2. Missionaries of the Caroline Islands who have faculties from their respective superiors are qualified to hear confessions on board ship with special leave from the Prefect-Apostolic of the district.

II.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE INQUISITION:

1. Decides that religious superiors are not to inquire into the affairs of their subjects which have been proposed to the Holy Office.
2. Baptism may be lawfully administered with water mixed with bichloride of mercury, where there is danger of contagion.

III.—S. CONGREGATION OF RITES:

1. Answers that a cleric acting as subdeacon at solemn Mass is not privileged to purify the chalice.
2. Women are to walk separately with their own sex in processions.
3. The votive Mass of the Sacred Heart may be said on the first Friday in January, even if it occur on the vigil of the Epiphany.

4. The Hebdomadary incensing the Blessed Sacrament at the *Magnificat* in Solemn Vespers is not to wear the stole.
5. Rose-colored vestments may be used even at low Masses on *Laetare* (fourth Sunday in Lent) and *Gaudete* (third Sunday in Advent) Sundays.
6. The liturgical litanies may be chanted in triple invocations by the choir, the congregation making response by the fourth invocation.

INTELLECTUAL PROGRESS AMONG THE CLERGY.

Of late years there have been attempts made in some of our dioceses by priests intelligent, and zealous for learning, to organize conferences in which they might at fixed intervals discuss topics in dogmatic or in moral theology, in ecclesiastical history, or in the various branches of science which border upon moral or religious topics. To these THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has been a help and often a guide, and we have frequently, when possible, gone out of our way to deal exhaustively with questions proposed in these gatherings. Where such conferences had the countenance of the authorities, they have prospered. In one or two cases which we learnt of, the Bishop thought it advisable to suppress incipient efforts made in this direction, either because he deemed them superfluous, or because it was feared that the conferences might lead to sectional movements antagonistic to the peace and harmony desirable in the body of the clergy. Regarding this phase of the subject we have no opinion to express, as he Bishop is judge and master in his diocese. In general it will, however, be admitted that such movements are productive of good, as they favor a certain uniformity of views and actions on important pastoral and disciplinary questions.

But recently there has been started a movement, which seems to us

A DECIDED ADVANCE,

because it is headed by the Bishop himself. We refrain from mentioning persons and places, as we have no special authorization to discuss the affairs of any diocese, and partly because it is not at

all necessary for the purpose of illustrating the excellence of the method adopted that we should go into details. Suffice it to say that that Ordinary, on occasion of the examinations of the junior clergy, proposed to them the formation of an *Academia*, that is a society, the object of which was to induce the priests who were so inclined to pursue special studies. He suggested that they make selection, each, of some particular study, giving attention to it almost to the exclusion of other accustomed reading, and that this study should be so directed as to enable them to give an account of the results at the end of each year, which might take the shape of an essay intended for publication. The subject was merely proposed for their consideration at the conference, and they were entirely free to act upon it or not. The Bishop's principal aim was in reality to form thinkers and writers sufficiently equipped to do battle in the warfare against modern error, and to become intellectual as well as moral leaders of the Catholic people in his diocese. The above was, briefly and broadly stated, the programme of the Bishop.

Two questions will at once occur to the mind regarding the success of the proposed scheme. First, will a sufficient number of priests be interested enough to pledge themselves to the tasks which, though self-imposed at the outset, imply a somewhat trying obligation? The answer to this is the practical result of the Bishop's proposal, who, as was stated, had left the members of his clergy perfectly free to take up and pursue courses indicated, or to put a quietus on the suggested movement. Shortly after the conference most of the junior clergy, altogether more than twenty per cent. of the whole number of priests in the diocese, offered to enter upon special studies. If we remember that the older clergy are naturally debarred from direct coöperation in such a scheme, and that even among the younger pastors many hardly have the time to assume any responsibilities beyond their pastoral work, the supervising of their schools, and attending outlying missions in the rural districts, it must be confessed that the Bishop, who does not live in a very populous city, with a cultured young clergy around him, possesses marvellous power of inspiring his priests with the ideals which have probably guided him successfully in his own pastoral life.

The second question that occurs to us is: Suppose that the young priests devote their spare time scrupulously to the special studies suggested, who will guarantee their ability to write for publication at the end of the year; and, if their essays are not published, will it not produce in them the feeling that they have wasted their time, and will not this tend to discourage them in their study?

We answer that, in order to form writers you must begin somewhere. And the first thing that seems necessary for an efficient beginning is the acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge is the most essential element in power of expression. If genius is an unlimited capacity for work, the output of that capacity is apt to bear the marks of genius. The literary habit may be an inborn inclination, but it is as often the evidence of a desire to teach what one knows well and loves. In urging his men therefore to work upon definite fields the Bishop assures his priests of one certain effect, namely the attainment of special knowledge which they are likely to value as they proceed in unfolding the secrets and beauties inherent in all truth whether of the natural or supernatural order.

But in assuming that in some cases, or even in all, the desired results of appearing as authoritative writers on the subject of their special studies, be not reached, could that be called failure? Surely no. The study, the attempt to bring the results of a year's labor in one or other of its phases to paper, as a sort of an audit of one's intellectual accounts and an endeavor to impart the knowledge acquired to others in form which admits of varying degrees of excellence and literary polish, is surely a gain. And in this way alone is talent brought out and perfected, so that eventually the man who has studied carefully and writes, and writes again, is sure to succeed.

In forming this estimate of the case we have left wholly out of account the pleasure of mind that comes from the pursuit of such work—*labor ipse voluptas;* the influence which intellectual occupation exercises upon the disposition and character of the individual; the opportunities it opens up for intercourse with intellectual men, often of the most fruitful kind, because it fosters religious spirit or at least lessens irreligious prejudice; the honor

which a studious and educated priest reflects upon his fraternity and his people; the silent power which intellectual habits exercise upon those outside the fold; finally, the pitfalls of moral ruin which a habit of study bridges over for the young priest during those early years of his ministry when steady occupation is his main protection against temptations that need only repeated opportunity, such as idleness gives, to entrap him.

The programme of special studies taken up by the members of the *Academia* here spoken of embraces the following branches: Ecclesiastical History, Sacred Scripture, Apologetics, Sociology, Geology, Biology, Philology, Church Architecture, Christian Archæology, and Pedagogy. The subjects are all of decided importance. The Bishop indicates to his priests as far as may be the main literary sources whence the members may draw information. He gives them the benefit and weight of his authority to facilitate inquiry, association with well-known specialists, access to libraries, and by calling their attention to helpful publications that come under his own notice.

Everybody who is capable of properly appreciating efforts of this kind on the part of the individual priest will realize what it means to him to have the encouragement of his bishop. A talented life is often left bare of results, and perchance shipwrecked, through a lack of encouragement and direction; gifted men are soured and alienated from their sacred allegiance frequently for want of sympathy on the part of superiors who might easily turn the talent and industry of their subjects into useful channels and thus increase the account of the glory of Holy Church.

STOLE AND COPE AT VESPERS.

Qu. Is it proper to use the purple stole and cope at Vespers and Benediction on Sundays when purple color is prescribed?

Resp. The use of the purple cope (without stole) at Benediction is proper, if Benediction follows immediately upon the Vespers of the day. It, therefore, suffices to use the white humeral veil over the purple cope for the act of Benediction.

"Si expositio SS. Sacramenti immediate sequatur aliud officium divinum, et sacerdos pluviali coloris respondentis Officio diei indutus

non recedat ab altari, tunc paramentis non mutatis velum humerale albi coloris assumatur. Quatenus vero recedat et expositio habeatur tamquam functio distincta ab officio praecedenti, paramenta albi coloris adhibeantur. Nec tamen improbandus usus assumendi pluviale album pro expositione SS. Sacramenti, etiamsi ipsa immediate sequatur officium cui competit color diversus." [1]

But the stole may be worn during the Vesper service only when exposition of the Blessed Sacrament takes place before the Office of Vespers which concludes with Benediction. This appears from a decision of the S. Congregation in answer to a question proposed by the Bishop of Shrewsbury in 1883. The Bishop asked:

"An foret contra Decreta, alias edicta a S. Rituum Congregatione, si sacerdos, antequam induat pluviale pro Vesperis, simul sumat amictum et stolam propter Benedictionem SSi. quae Vesperas statim secutura est? Et quatenus hoc sit prohibitum, quaeritur: an sacerdos pluviali indutus illud apud altare deponere et reassumere debeat, sumptis interim amictu et stola, et hoc etiamsi paramenta non sint coloris albi?"

The reply of the S. Congregation was:

"Licet sumere amictum et stolam, *si ante Vesperas fiat expositio*, et benedictio immediate illas sequatur." [2]

Since the stole is not to be worn at Vespers, unless the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, with Benediction following, it will be equally convenient to have the white cope (after putting on the white stole) substituted for the cope of the color of the Office worn at Vespers.[3]

EASTER WATER.

Qu. Would you kindly explain the purpose for which Easter water is to be used. My neighbor, a well informed priest, told the congregation of which he is the assistant pastor, that it is to be used only during the octave of Easter; that after that (so, I am told, he said), if they needed water, it were better to get it fresh from the well.

[1] Rit. Salop. cit. in Decret. S. R. 3593, ad II.

[2] S. R. C., Sept. 19, 1883, n. 3593 prior. 5892.

[3] See also V. d. Stappen, *De Officio Divino*, I, p. 307.

The priest's remarks have caused some comment, and I have been asked several times for information. Now, although I supposed Easter water was not to be used in the administration of the Sacraments, in common with the laity I had always thought it was a pious custom for Catholics to keep it in their homes, to be used in the blessing of themselves and their houses, and that the blessing to the water, unlike an insurance policy, did not expire at a certain time.

NEO EBORA.

Resp. The Easter water is blessed as a sacramental and intended to remind the faithful of the graces imparted to them through the washing from original sin which is the effect of their baptism. Being sprinkled with this blessed water, which is hallowed by exorcisms and the prayers of Holy Church, the faithful are exhorted each time they use it to renew the pledge of their baptismal innocence. This is done principally during the season when the new catechumens are being baptized. The water thus blessed is therefore carried by the faithful to their homes, that it may serve the inmates as a reminder of their profession of faith and a pledge of fidelity to Holy Church.

Whilst, however, the Easter water has its immediate purpose as a sacramental at the Easter period when the baptismal vows were usually made and renewed, it would be absurd to assume that it loses its virtue when the Paschal time has expired. Not so. But as long as there is virtue in fresh resolves to lead a life worthy of our baptismal pledge, so long remains the efficacy of this water blessed for the purpose.

Hence we may apply here precisely the words which St. Chrysostom uses with reference to the water blessed on occasion of the Epiphany, for it was at this time that the Church used to commemorate the Baptism of our Lord. He says: "On this day Christ has sanctified by His Baptism the very nature of all waters. Hence the faithful come to draw water on this festival at midnight and carry it to their homes, *and preserve it the whole year*, because on this day was the element of water sanctified."[1] The very same reason applies to the Easter water, since, as we said above, it is kept principally to recall the very first benefit bequeathed to the Christian as a fruit of Christ's Redemption. Of course it is pos-

[1] *Oratio de Baptism. Christi.* Op. tom. II, col. 366.

sible that the keeping of this, as of every other blessed object which is of its nature perishable, may become a nuisance; but against such abuse there are other remedies besides condemning the use of the object.

ARE CATHOLICS OBLIGED TO SUPPORT THE CATHOLIC PRESS? —NOT ALWAYS.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:[1]

We see continually statements in some of our Catholic journals to the effect that Catholics are in conscience obliged to support the Catholic press,—which means, apparently, the particular newspaper that makes this appeal under a religious pretext, whilst in all respects, if judged according to journalistic standards pure and simple, it is not worth the paper and printer's ink mailed weekly to its befuddled subscribers. I wish THE DOLPHIN, which evidently has a high conception of editorial responsibility, would do something to dissipate the notion that every Catholic is bound to subscribe to a concern that appeals to him in the name of religion, merely because it prints the Lenten regulations and sundry cheap cuts of Fathers X— or Y—, whom it usually canonizes before his time, probably thereby intending to vindicate its claim to being a rightful organ of the Catholic faith.

Now it is true that Leo XIII, like his predecessor Pius IX, insists that Catholics should support the religious press in their respective districts. It is likewise true that if Catholics do not support a paper when it is in its modest beginnings, it can not prosper so as to improve. But it ought to be remembered that what the Chief Pastor of Christendom means when he desires Catholics to support the Catholic press is that they second and support *honest* and *capable* efforts to enlighten them in truth through the medium of the printing-press. That is undoubtedly what all the Pontifical exhortations mean. Now, honest and capable efforts to enlighten the faithful by means of a journal or magazine mean, I make bold to assert, two things—not less:

First, that the newspaper or magazine eschew all methods of obtaining support, whether by subscriptions or advertisements, which savor of false pretences.

A common way to launch a journalistic enterprise is that of making grandiloquent announcements of what the paper is *going to be*; of

[1] While this letter was addressed primarily to THE DOLPHIN, it will interest also the readers of the REVIEW.

obtaining, on the score of these prophecies, the endorsement of priests and bishops whose expressions of approbation, like those of respectable prophets generally, though conditionally worded, serve as a bait inspiring confidence. Next a glib agent exhibits the "approbations" to individual Catholics, much like a personal introduction from the bishop or priest, asking for a subscription. Advertisers are coerced or cajoled into giving their business cards, trusting the large (prospective) circulation or fearing to have themselves frozen out of legitimate trade by little squibs booming their competitors in business. Next to *obtaining* advertisements under false pretences there is the practice of *presenting* advertisements under false colors, or worse, of printing advertisements that do not simply lie as to what they promise, but which are altogether out of place in a religious publication, if not positively scandalous, because they make propaganda for what the Church and decent morals forbid.

Secondly, the newspaper which claims Catholic patronage in the name of the Church or Bishop should be *capable*, that is to say, the editor should have the literary education, the courage of his religious convictions, respect for legitimate ecclesiastical and civil authority, tact and discretion, together with practical information entitling him to take the moral leadership of a Catholic community to whom his paper appeals on grounds of religious fellowship. A man who lacks these qualifications is simply an intruder in the field of Catholic journalism, which has the mission to teach Catholic truth and goodness and to do it in a live and practical way, demonstrating its own honest purpose in the act itself. How far that is done in individual cases must be left to the judgment of the conscientious reader; but if it be not done, he is, it seems to me, perfectly justified not only in refusing his support to a paper or magazine that lacks the ability to carry out the noble purpose which it pretends, but he is justified in also discouraging others from supporting it. Such literary ventures are simply intended to provide bread and butter for penurious editors who presume to feed on the healthy body of the Church, and they have no more claim to encouragement in their profession than has a surgeon who undertakes to perform a delicate and vital operation without proper instruments or requisite skill.

I imagine from some experience in this matter, that where these requisities of honesty of purpose and ability coexist, Catholic journalism has less to fear—at least just now, in this country—than most other business enterprises, owing to the fact that the clergy are really agents

for every good work of the kind,—and God bless the priests who are so! Despite the critics, it is true that we have some excellent Catholic weeklies which seem to prosper, and there are others which seem to move comfortably, though they are wicked enough to commit pilfering (not to call it pirating),—a practice which occasionally receives a jolt from some patient press lord who swoops down on them or exposes their systematic tricks to the reading public,—as *The Ave Maria*, which pays for its matter and selects it as a rule with evident care, has occasionally felt called on to do. Our better papers and magazines would prosper even more but for the horde of incapable and unscrupulous editors who, while they eke out a scanty existence for themselves, consume in the gross much air and food intended for healthier Catholic growth, destroying at the same time the taste of their readers for any better intellectual and religious pabulum.

I hold that the "press" which is labelled "Catholic" is sometimes a counterfeit that ought to be cashiered. The good papers could then live better and become better. But the last item brings another thought, about prices of Catholic papers and magazines, to mind which I would like to ventilate. I will only say this that the cry for cheap reading matter is often a trifle unreasonable. Good Catholic reading matter is a precious commodity for which we ought to pay a just price; that is, a price that permits the producers, who write for a limited circle of readers and who must write with discrimination and care, a sufficient compensation for their work. As Mr. O'Donnell, an old journalist, says in a recent number of *The Tablet* (London): Respectable Catholics will pay high prices for dogs and horses and other commodities of life, but in the matter of Catholic charities they want cheap rates and broad advertisement. I am glad THE DOLPHIN has not fallen into the error of underbidding our other high-class magazines. It is sure to prosper, if I am anything of a prophet; and it contains more solid and reliable reading matter, set out with fine taste, than half a dozen magazines. Therefore it would be cheap in price even at double its present subscription rate. Perhaps some of my confrères may be induced to give an expression of their views to show that I am right in my estimate of the duty of Catholics to support *only* an *honest* and *capable* Catholic publication.

JOURNALIST.

THE "TRUE PURPLE" OF THE TEMPLE VEIL.

Qu. You mentioned in a previous number of THE DOLPHIN that the maidens of the tribe of Juda or rather of the House of David were selected in the Old Law to weave the Temple veil that separated the Holy Court from the Inner Sanctuary, to which the sacrificing priests alone were admitted; and that at the time of the Annunciation our Blessed Lady was weaving the *true purple*, which had fallen to her lot. This charming detail, which you further explain, is, as I understand, taken from the Apocryphal writings of the Apostolic days, and of historical value, though not vouched for by inspiration, as are the other sacred writings. Will you be good enough to say in one of your next conferences what is meant by the *true* purple. There was, I suppose, a false purple; but it would be interesting to know what constituted the difference, and whether it was merely a question of the fastness of color or something more?

Resp. The true purple spoken of in connection with the curtains of the sanctuary was a portion of the texture made of fine wool having a light reddish tint. The coloring matter for this cloth was obtained from a small vessel in the throat of a species of shell-fish called *murex trunculus* (Linnaeus). The quantity of dyeing material yielded by a single fish amounted to only one small drop, so that, if we consider the fact that the animal had to be sought almost exclusively on the southeastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, it is easy to understand of how precious a value the dye was.

At the time of Josephus, when the Roman Emperor Titus carried off the spoils of the Temple of Jerusalem, a pound of wool dyed with this true purple (which was distinguished from a somewhat inferior quality of amethyst or violet purple) cost 1000 denars, or about 217 dollars. The amethyst purple wool, which was of less value, although still considered a rare cloth, sold at a little over one-third of that sum, about 80 dollars of our money for a pound. It is not surprising, therefore, that the word for "true purple" (*argaman*) should have been, as some philologists interpret it, considered synonymous with the expression "costly," and assumed to be identical with the Sanscrit word *râgaman*.

Some estimate can be formed of the enormous value of the Temple curtains in the days of Herod when we read the account

which Josephus gives of the dimensions and beauty of the sanctuary veil of which there is question here. He tell us[1] that this veil covered the full extent of the gates that led into the Holy of Holies. These gates, all overlaid with solid plates of gold, measured (roughly speaking, and not including the top ornaments of vines, etc.) about 90 by 30 feet. "It was a Babylonian curtain embroidered with blue (hyacinth) and fine linen, and scarlet, and purple, and of a contexture that was truly wonderful." According to the Hebrew *Shekalim* (viii, 5), mentioned by Dr. Bludau,[2] the thickness of this gigantic veil was a full hand's breadth, so that it could hardly be lifted at the extremities by one person. Hence a space of an ell (about three feet) was left between the two wings of the curtain for the high priest to enter freely. The weaving of this veil occupied eighty-two virgins, רבוא (probably ריבות), especially selected for the difficult work.

It should be stated here that the actual curtain suspended in the Herodian temple at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, which Josephus witnessed, was burnt; but there was a duplicate of the great sanctuary veil, and duplicates of the other temple curtains, kept in reserve for the annual changes in connection with the atonement and other sacrifices, when the high priest entered from the Southern Gate.

"ROSE" AS A LITURGICAL COLOR.

On the fourth Sunday of Lent, called *Laetare* (Joyful) Sunday, because the liturgy of that day indicates a spirit of hopeful joy in the anticipated accomplishment of the Redemption, the rubrics of the Ceremonial of Bishops state[1] that the purple vestments indicative of the penitential spirit are to be, if possible, exchanged for the color of rose (*rosacei coloris*). Most writers on rubrics state that this color of vestment can be used only at the solemn Mass of *Laetare* Sunday. But the Sacred Congregation has recently decided that *rose* is the proper liturgical color for *Laetare* and *Gaudete* (third Sunday of Advent) Sundays, and may therefore be used at low Mass, as well as in the solemn functions.[2]

[1] *Jewish War*, Bk. V, Ch. 5, n. 4.

[2] *Katholik*, Feb. 1902. "Der Verbleib der Gerāthe d. Tempels."

[1] Lib. II, c. XIII, n. 11; and XX, n. 2.

[2] Decree of S. Congr. of Rites, Nov. 29, 1901.

THE TRIPLE INVOCATION IN CHANTING THE LITANY.

The method of chanting the indulgenced litanies in public devotions by allowing the choir to sing three invocations, the congregation answering by the fourth, has the endorsement of the S. Congregation.[1]

A CLERIC IN MINOR ORDERS ACTING AS SUBDEACON.

If a cleric in minor orders acts, by special permission of the Ordinary, as subdeacon at a high Mass, he is not thereby privileged to purify the chalice after the Communion. This privilege belongs exclusively to those who are actually in sacred orders.[2]

PICTURES OF THE RESURRECTION.

Some years ago a priest, who desired to have the mysteries of the Rosary represented in the stained-glass windows of his church, had his attention called to the fact that the cartoons representing the Resurrection (the first Glorious Mystery) implied a misstatement of the facts as recorded in the sacred text. There we read: "But (Jesus) rose (rising) early in the first day of the week. And behold there was a great earthquake. For an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and coming rolled back the stone and sat upon it. And his countenance was as lightning, and his raiment as snow. And for fear of him (the angel), the guards were struck with terror, and became as dead men." (Matt. 28: 2–4; Mark 16: 9.)

It appears from this that our Lord was not seen by the guards, who became terrified at the noise of the earthquake and the appearance of the angel who rolled back the stone, all of which took place after the Resurrection. "Most commentators," says Father Maas,[3] "agree that the earthquake and the descent of the angel and the rolling away of the stone did not precede, or even accompany the Resurrection of Jesus. Many writers connect all these events with the approach of the women, who had been deliberating on the road as to who should roll away the stone

[1] Decree of S. Congr. of Rites, Dec. 6, 1901.
[2] Decree, Dec. 6, 1901.
[3] *Life of Christ*, p. 554.

for them." After the return from Limbo the body, reunited to the soul of Jesus who had suffered and atoned for the sins of man, was now glorified. "Thus glorified, Jesus rose from the sepulchre without further external manifestation, so that the guards were left in perfect ignorance of what had taken place. The grave remained intact"; that is to say, the transfigured body of Jesus passed through the walls of His tomb without disturbing the stone, just as the light of the X-ray passes through crystal and solid matter.

Hence the conventional representation which makes the transfigured body of our Lord ascend out of the open grave is not historically accurate, nor does it express the mystery of the Resurrection in its full significance of the crowning miracle which established the Divinity of Jesus Christ. In the scene of the Resurrection the grave should be closed, Christ appearing above it triumphantly rising, and the guards looking in the direction of our Lord, but dazed, without seeming to see or comprehend what is really taking place. The scene in which the angel is pictured sitting beside the opened grave, with the holy women entering the tomb, must properly be termed "After the Resurrection."

"A STITCH IN TIME."

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

If you will give me the space of a few lines, I think that what I have to say will be productive of good and will prevent some occasional disappointment and regret among the brethren.

A little over a year ago, having run down in health from one cause or another, I was obliged to give up my duties and seek rest and fresh vigor away from home. When I was about to return, my Bishop assigned me to this mission, as offering a better chance for my complete recovery. Shortly after coming here one day towards the end of the month the REVIEW came, addressed to my predecessor, who had died just prior to my appointment. This bethought me to write to the New York office advising them of my change of address as well as of the decease of the former incumbent of this mission. In regular course I had a letter from the office, thanking me for notification of the discontinuance of Father A—'s subscription and asking me to say by enclosed self-addressed and stamped envelope who was executor for

the deceased, as the subscription fee for a year and six months was owing. I was glad to furnish the information desired.

Meantime I had discovered that in forwarding my books and other belongings from my last residence the sexton had not packed four numbers of last year's REVIEW. These I wrote for; but only two of them could be found. To my regret, of these two only one could be supplied from New York, and my file would thus have been broken had not I secured in the most casual way the looked-for copy. All's well that ends well, and with this reflection I was well content to leave the matter there.

But that was not the end. It happened very soon after that, during a visit to a friend the REVIEW furnished one of our topics, and in the course of our conversation it turned out that he had been the victim of a somewhat kindred experience. He had only recently returned from a rather extended visit to Europe, and was now unable to gather some of the numbers of the REVIEW that had issued during his absence. Like me he had made the mistake of not seeing to it that his copies were either held in New York until his return or otherwise secured for him. Beyond the natural sympathy at the disappointment of a friend, especially when one is unable to relieve the discomfiture or make up the loss, I thought nothing more of the case. But when, within a half-year, I heard of a mishap sufficiently similiar to recall to mind Father X—'s and my own experience, as befalling Father Q—, it occurred to me that a recital of these happenings might be made to point a moral, if they do not adorn a tale. And I write you therefore, in the hope that the lessons I have taken from the affair may be of benefit also to others, for transfers and vacations and absences from home for this or for that cause are of not uncommon occurrence among the clergy, who in the worry and hurry of removal or leaving may overlook such things, to their regret and disappointment later.

As this is my first direct communication with the editorial rooms I desire to take advantage of it to express to you my sense of . . .

J. O'K.

Resp. The last few words are meant for our private edification. They are a comfort to the editor. What precedes hardly concerns the editorial sanctum. But as we are willing to publish any suggestions made in good faith and likely to be of service to our readers, we consulted with our manager and he bids us take the occasion to point the lessons suggested by the above communica-

tion, viz., that for the good of all concerned it is best and easiest to report changes of address at once, whether the change is permanent or only temporary; that in the event of a copy of the REVIEW being sent after the death of a brother priest, it is a kindness to notify the publisher; and that—if we mention this in this place, it is because we have been trapped into it by our esteemed correspondent—it is wiser to pay our debts than to leave them to those who come after, who will then have to add our burdens to their own.

THE PRIEST LEADING THE "VIA CRUCIS" FROM THE PULPIT.

Qu. Is it permissible for the priest in conducting the *Way of the Cross* to remain in the ulpit instead of moving from station to station, as is the usual custom instituted by St. Leonard of Port Maurice?

Resp. It is not necessary that the priest go from station to station, but unless there be an indult *de speciali gratia in exemplum non afferenda*, "attentis peculiaribus circumstantiis" (Rescript. authent. n. 408; 10 Mar. 1868), it is required that some person lead the way from one station to another, while the prayers are said by the priest from the pulpit. This we would infer from a recent decision of the S. Congreg. of Indulgences in reply to a *dubium* proposed last year by the Procurator General of the Institute of School Brothers. The *Dubium* reads:

"Quum ex Decreto S. C. Indulg. diei 6 Aug. 1757 in tuto positum sit pium exercitium Viae Crucis peragi aliquando posse absque motu locali de una statione ad aliam; sed juxta methodum a S. Leonardo a Portu Mauritio praescriptam in publico exercitio, unoquoque de populo locum suum tenente Sacerdos possit cum duobus clericis sive cantoribus circumire ac sistere in qualibet statione, ibique recitare consuetas preces, modo quaeritur:

I. An ista methodus item servari queat, ob loci augustiam, in Sacellis domorum Communitatum religiosarum.

Et quatenus affirmative:

II. An loco sacerdotis cum duobus clericis, unus tantum e fratribus non sacerdos circumire ac sistere in qualibet statione suetasque preces recitare valeat.

Porro S. Congtio, audito unius ex Consultoribus voto, praefatis dubiis respondendum mandavit:

Affirmative ad utrumque.

Datum Romae ex Secria ejusdem S. Congnis die 27 Febr. 1901.

P. Beringer, S.J., in his latest edition of *Die Ablässe* mentions the same condition as a modification of the original rule, which required that a priest conduct the Way of the Cross when made in common by a congregation.

THE ASHES BLESSED ON ASH WEDNESDAY.

Qu. There were a number of priests at my place the day after Ash Wednesday, and the question came up: "What did you do with the blessed ashes that were left over after the placing of them on the foreheads of the faithful?" Some said that they gave them to the people to be taken to their homes; others condemned this practice, and maintained that the ashes remaining over ought to be burned. Kindly inform me through your valuable REVIEW if there is any positive law governing the matter.

J. K.

Resp. We mentioned on a former occasion that the S. Congregation had refused to answer the question whether the practice of giving some of the ashes to persons who wish to carry them away for reverent use as a sacramental might be approved. The Archbishop of Colombo (Ceylon) had written to Rome, stating that in his missions the practice prevailed of Christians taking the blest ashes home with them in order that they might apply them in form of a sacramental to the forehead of the sick, etc. He asked whether or not, in view of the Constitution of Pope Benedict XIV, *Omnium sollicitudinum* (which forbade the ashes to be used in any other way than that prescribed by the Church), the above-mentioned custom might be tolerated. In reply, the S. Congregation simply wrote: "*Non esse interloquendum.*"[1]

This means that the question was not to be categorically answered or discussed by the S. Congregation for the purpose of giving a decision. The reason seems plain. In itself the use of the ashes as a sacramental by the laity cannot be censured, nor is it excluded by the words of Benedict XIV, when duly considered

[1] *Cf.* S. R. C., May 7, 1892; *Collectanea*, n. 2197.

in their context. On the other hand the custom may easily be abused. Since, however, it rests with the priest who blesses the ashes to dispense or to withhold them, his discretion should be a sufficient safeguard for the reverence of the usage. It lies with him to explain the doctrine of the Church which prevents superstitious use of the ashes, and his warnings (if necessary) against possible desecration are supposed to reach the faithful to whom he ministers.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE UNION OF THE CLERGY.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

I think your readers will be very much interested at hearing of the formation of a "Total Abstinence Society" among the clergy of Ireland. This is the first time, as far as I have ever heard, that the thing has been done, although of course many Irish priests and bishops have professed and practised this heroic virtue, and the bishops, individually and collectively, have again and again, and more than ever of late, denounced the drinking customs of the people. The present clerical movement dates back to 1896, and a letter inviting members was published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Review* for June of that year. It did not succeed according to the hopes of its projectors, and was allowed to lapse. In October, 1901, however, more than a score of priests, representing as many more again, met in Father Mathew's own city, Cork, and organized the "Father Mathew Union of Total Abstainers," asked their bishops' blessing, which was gladly and freely accorded, and now the Union is progressing by leaps and bounds, and the turning of the tide of drunkenness that has in recent years been devastating the land of Father Mathew, may be expected to take place.

My cousin, Father M'Swiney, V.G., of Cork, is President of the Union, and the Rev. Walter O'Brien is Secretary and Treasurer. Your readers are, I presume, aware that Father Siebenfoercher, of Kenton, Ohio, started a similar association in 1898, and is trying to introduce the heroic degree of Temperance into ecclesiastical seminaries as well. Let us all recommend to God in the Holy Mass this holy and salutary movement.

Mount St. Mary's, Maryland. EDWARD MCSWEENY.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. Is it a Fad?—*The Northwestern Christian Advocate*, a Methodist periodical published in Chicago, is of opinion that the production of new translations of the Bible into "what the authors or editors claim to be the language of the people" has already gone too far and tends to destroy the reverence due to Sacred Scripture. "There are at least half a dozen of these so-called modern English Bibles—each of which in many vital respects differs from the others, and none of which equals in sublimity and power of language the old version." Still another new translation has been added by J. B. Rotherham,[1] presenting a highly elaborate system of signs and symbols which on first view signify nothing. In point of fact, however, these marks are intended to bring the reader into touch with the original, showing how "the words would be read aloud in Hebrew." Where the emphasis marks prove insufficient, brief notes are added. Is it worth the labor? Most certainly, if the true meaning of the sacred text is thus expressed more clearly.

2. Late Authorship of our Sacred Books.—Our recent literature has given additional proof of the tendency to assign late dates to our inspired writings in the case of the Hexateuch, the Book of Judges, the Prophets Isaias, Amos, Nahum, and of the third and fourth Gospels. Thus Prof. Baudissin[2] defends the composite character and the late origin of the Hexateuch, differing from the current critical opinion only with regard to the position of Deuteronomy. He maintains that Deuteronomy (D) followed the Priest Codex (P), though he admits P to have been unknown outside priestly circles prior to 444 A. D.—Here may be mentioned F. B. Meyer's work *Joshua and the Land of Promise*,[3] since

[1] *The Emphasized Bible*, Vol. I, Genesis to Ruth. Allenson. Royal 8vo, pp. 288. 8s.

[2] *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testamentes.* Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1901.

[3] Morgan and Scott, pp. 193. 2s. 6d.

it deals with a portion of the Hexateuch. The writer views Josue in God's own prophetic vision of him as revealed to us in the history of Christ. And as Josue typifies Christ, so does the Land of Promise prefigure "the land of morning glories and unexampled green."—The Rev. M. J. Lagrange[4] is inclined to place the last redactor of the Book of Judges in the time of Esdras. This opinion is not new among Catholic scholars, but its acceptance on the part of the Reverend author in preference to other views is in keeping with the general tendency of our age to date the authorship or the redaction of our Sacred Books as late as possible. Father Lagrange's article is really a summary of an up-to-date introduction to the Book of Judges, and deserves the attention of all Biblical students. Prof. Baudissin (*l. c.*) gives a demonstration, which to some appears convincing, that Is. 40–66 is not from the pen of Isaias. The unity of the Book of Isaias was defended last year by Dr. W. H. Cobb;[5] but the writer's arguments were put to the test and pronounced inconclusive by Dr. König, of Bonn.[6] This does not imply that the last word has been said on the question.—Contrary to the opinion of most modern scholars, Edward Day and Walter H. Chapin regard the general tone of the Book of Amos as post-exilic.[7] In order to escape the arguments urged for the pre-exilic authorship of the book, the foregoing writers assume that the author of Amos put his words in the mouth of one supposed to have lived in the days of Jeroboam II. Dean Farrar thus expresses the common opinion on the authorship of Amos: "It is, however, certain that Amos wrote in the days of King Jeroboam II, probably about B. C. 755."[8] In an article entitled *The Composition of Nahum*, 1: 1–2: 3,[9] W. R. Arnold considers the greater part of Nah. 1 as the work of a late redactor who attempted to prefix a poem as an introduction to the prophet when copying his book. But in this attempt he forgot not only parts of the poem, but also its original order and its alphabetical structure. Unable to finish his intended introduction, he began to

[4] *Revue biblique*, January, 1902, p. 21.
[5] *Journal of Biblical Literature for 1901*, pp. 77–100.
[6] *Expository Times*, November and December, 1901, pp. 90–94, 132–135.
[7] *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, January, 1902.
[8] *The Expositor*, February, 1902, p. 82.
[9] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft ii, 901, pp. 225–265.

copy the text, inserting here and there phrases of the poem as they occurred to his memory and concluding this sort of work with 2 : 3.

In the field of New Testament study there has been, it is true, a notable reaction towards the traditional dates of the Sacred Books; but in certain cases this tendency has not been strong enough to vindicate the early authorship against modern critical views. P. C. Sense, e. g., has published *A Critical and Historical Enquiry*,[10] in which he arrives at the conclusion that "the Third Gospel was compiled from the writing used by the sect of the Marcionites, known as the Marcionite Gospel, and from the writings of minor apostles, known as the Apocryphal Gospels." The former document was written in Pontus, before 150 A. D., by Luke, Lucanus, or Lucianus the Marcionite; the canonical Gospel was published between 168 and 177 A. D.—On the other hand, M. Jean Réville advances the customary arguments against the ancient traditions as to the life of St. John in Ephesus and his authorship of the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the three Epistles.[11] He emphasizes the Alexandrian or Judaeo-Hellenistic character of the Fourth Gospel as well as the allegorical nature of its narrative, and its love for theology and metaphysics rather than for historical truth. In accordance with the Logos idea of the prologue, M. Réville divides the first portion of the Gospel into three parts: (1) Christ manifests Himself as the *principle of the new economy*, 1 : 35–4 : 42; (2) He reveals Himself as the *principle of life*, 4 : 43–6 : 71; (3) He represents Himself as the *light* opposed by the growing enmity of the world and the darkness, 7 : 1–12 : 50.

3. Objective Value of the Foregoing Theories. — What is a Biblical scholar to think of the tendency to abandon the traditional view concerning the age and authorship of our Sacred Books?

1. In some cases it is the result of ignorance or critical incapacity. Mr. Sense's theory as to the origin of the Third Gospel is a case in point. The author bravely states that historical criticism is in

[10] *The Origin of the Third Gospel.* Williams and Norgate. 8vo, pp. 614. 7s. 6d.

[11] *Le Quatrième Évangile et sa valeur historique.* Paris: Leroux. 1901. 8vo, pp. viii—344.

favor of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, being regarded as the founder of Christianity; he is inclined to credit the story of Simonides that he had himself "penned the Codex Sinaiticus in the monastery of Pantelæmon on Mount Athos as recently as 1839 and 1840;" he considers Westcott and Hort's edition of St. Luke's Gospel as "not only incompatible and inconsistent with, but also utterly repugnant to, their great merits as scholars and gentlemen;" he accuses Volckmar of "great swinging falsehoods;" he explains the parable of the unjust steward by cooking the text, and then rendering "make *not* friends to yourselves of the mammon of unrighteousness."

2. In other cases our Sacred Books are assigned a late authorship on account of a preconceived theory on the part of the critic. If Prof. Baudissin,[12] e. g., assumes that Hebrew monotheism grew out of a primitive nature worship, he may be correct in maintaining that as late as the ninth and eighth centuries B. C. the formation of myth and legend constructed the traditional pre-Mosaic and Mosaic periods of Hebrew history. Thus the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is simply ruled out of court; Moses cannot even be the last author or redactor of the books ascribed to him by tradition.[13] — Again, Conybeare[14] finds in Eusebius and Justin Martyr evidence for a briefer wording of the apostolic commission in Matt. 28: 19, and without regard to the results of other students[15] he forthwith asks whether the shorter formula be not the original one; whether the longer text was not created between 130 and 140 A. D.; whether it be not due to the influence of the liturgical formula used in the administration of Baptism; whether it did not originate in the African Old Latin texts, and travel thence into the Roman Greek text, and establish itself in the East during the Nicene epoch. Such ready-made *a priori* theories prove at least the fertility of a critic's imagination.

3. In other cases again the critical proofs for the late dates of our Sacred Books are inconclusive or merely subjective. Réville's method of arguing, e. g., has been found faulty by two

[12] *L. c.*, p. 209.

[13] *L. c.*, p. 64.

[14] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.* 1901. Heft 4, pp. 275–288.

[15] *Cf.*, e. g., Resch, *Paralleltexte*, Heft 2, pp. 398 ff.; The Baptismal Formula, by J. H. Bernard, in the *Expositor* for January, 1902, pp. 43–52.

writers of entirely different principles. W. Baldensperger[16] points out that Réville regards the prologue of the Fourth Gospel as the main prop of his Philonian theory, though the very heart of the prologue, "the word became flesh," has no parallel in Philo. Réville's attempt to conceal this weakness by the vague phrase "sans qu'il y ait positivement rupture" does not satisfy his reviewer. On the other hand, the Rev. Th. Calmes[17] proves from premises admitted by Réville the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.—To return once more to Baudissin's *Einleitung*, it considers our present sacred text as original whenever it makes against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; but passages favorable to the traditional view are represented as possible interpolations or textual corruptions. Thus Os. 12: 14 is said to be a passage whose genuineness has been questioned (p. 59); where Nathan in II Kings 7 prophesies about the future condition of the kingdom, the narrative is said to be, on the face of it, a quite recent interpolation (p. 245 f.). Similarly, the passage in Isaias dealing with the suffering of the servant is represented as corrupted by the exegetical attempts of the commentators (p. 404).—Harnack[18] contends that the First Gospel cannot have been written before 70 A. D., on the plea that it presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem in Mat. 22: 7; Otto Pfleiderer[19] finds in the First Gospel the picture of the faith and Christian life of the first half of the second century, so that according to his opinion it cannot have been written before the time of Adrian, and must be placed in the fourth rather than the third decennium. For similar reasons, Prof. W. C. van Manen believes the First Gospel was written in the first half of the second century, but not after 140 A. D.,[20] and Ad. Jülicher considers the time about 100 as the most probable date of the First Gospel.[21]—To add another example, Canon Henson[22] finds that the question of Apostolic Succession is bound

[16] *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, January 4, 1902.

[17] *Revue biblique*, January 1902, p. 116 f.

[18] *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, I. Leipzig, 1897, p. 653.

[19] *Das Urchristenthum*. Berlin, 1887, p. 542 f.

[20] *Handleiding voor oudchristelijke Letterkunde*. Leiden, 1900, p. 9.

[21] *Einleitung*, 3d edition, p. 242.

[22] *The Christian World Pulpit*, December 25, 1901.

up with the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. He forthwith pronounces this "an extremely unsatisfactory foundation for so tremendous an ecclesiastical claim," seeing that there are scholars who do not accept the Epistles "as genuine writings of St. Paul."

4. A critic's wrong idea of inspiration and of the authority belonging to an inspired book may influence him to postdate the authorship of a sacred volume. Angus M. Mackay, in the first chapter of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*,[23] tells us that the prophets were inspired, because they had a genius for religion. Shakespeare's poetic inspiration did not render him infallible in matters of history or botany, but only qualified him to turn historic events and flowers to high poetic usages. Thus prophetic inspiration does not guarantee its possessor against error in non-theological matters, but refers only to subjects pertaining to God. Such a view of inspiration once accepted, one may safely date the New Testament books after the Apostolic age, and in the field of Old Testament study one may subscribe to the views of J. P. Peters[24] concerning the development of Mosaims. The reformers of the later ages of Israel are supposed to refer their religious enactments back to Moses for their justification; the tradition of Moses' life and teaching which has come down to us, is from a much later period, and is strongly mixed with legendary elements.—The latest addition to *Nowack's Handkommentar*[25] furnishes us another illustration. Ezra-Nehemiah is said to be composed of four different elements: (1) Extracts from an Aramaic work, written about 450 B. C., and containing, besides other matter, *partly* authentic Aramaic translations of decrees of the Persian kings; (2) memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah; (3) other documents sometimes quoted verbatim; (4) the chronicler's own work. But it is the portion of the volume devoted to Esther that is specially objectionable. The writer agrees with Jensen in identifying the

[23] *The Churchman's Introduction to the Old Testament.* Methuen. Crown 8vo, pp. 317. 6s.

[24] *The Religion of Moses. Journal of Biblical Literature*, part ii, 1901, pp. 101–128.

[25] *Nowack's Handkommentar z. A. T.*, I. vi. 2: Ezra, Nehemiah, und Esther. Von C. Siegfrid. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister. 1901. M. 3.80.

leading characters of the Book of Esther with figures found in Babylonian myth-lore, though the Jewish writer, or writers, gave the story a wholly different coloring when transforming it for their own purposes.

5. If it be asked whether a Catholic can in no case agree with the critics in their tendency to ascribe late dates to the Sacred Books, we must keep in mind the following principles: (1) For a Catholic student, the authenticity of a sacred book may be bound up with its canonicity, either because it claims to belong to a certain inspired writer, or because it has been admitted into the canon precisely on account of its reputed authorship.[26] The Pauline Epistles, *e. g.*, excepting the Epistle to the Hebrews, claim St. Paul for their author; such real claims must be well kept apart from mere literary contrivances by virtue of which the Book of Wisdom, and perhaps also Ecclesiastes, are attributed to Solomon. Again, the Apocalypse was most probably admitted into the canon on account of its reputed Apostolic authorship. (2) Dogmatic considerations may be negative criteria for the date of a sacred book. It is not a mere caprice of Cardinal Franzelin that New Testament revelation closed with the time of the Apostles; nor can we be deaf to the claims of Christian apologists when they demand a solid historic foundation for their fundamental facts. This excludes post-apostolic dates in the case of our New Testament writings, and strongly affects the question of the Pentateuchal authorship. The suggestion of Mgr. Mignot[27] that our apologists might construct the history of Israel from the top downwards instead of from the bottom upwards, does not offer the true solution of the difficulty; not to insist on the unnatural process implied in the method, our critics have left so few and such diminutive parts of the Old Testament to pre-exilic times, that they are not sufficient to link Judaism with the Mosaic revelation. On the other hand, we believe it is a mere inadvertence on the part of Fr. Th. Calmes that he places the end of John 21, after the death of St. John.[28] (3) The authorship of a sacred book may rest on tradition. In this case we must, in the first

[26] *Études*, February 5, 1902, p. 347 f.
[27] *L'Apologétique et la Critique biblique*, p. 42 f.
[28] *Revue biblique*, January, 1902, p. 117.

place, examine into the precise value of the tradition that bears on the question; secondly, we must determine with accuracy the extent of the sacred text subject to the tradition. Fr. Lagrange[29] shows us in the case of the Book of Judges how to distinguish between an apparent and a real tradition, and Fr. Alfred Durand[30] textually examines which parts of the Pentateuch may be exempted from the traditional Mosaic authorship. If these precautions be taken, we shall not be apt to exaggerate the argument from tradition for the date and authorship of a sacred book.[31] It is well worth the trouble, seeing that we lose rather than gain by overstating an argument.

THEOLOGY.

IN the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (H. 1) P. Pejvska, C.SS.R., presents a study of the discussion, dating back to the thirteenth century, as to whether, in order to constitute a matrimonial impediment out of a *promissio matrimonii inter adulteros*, it is required that there should be a *repromissio*. He goes into the history of the discussion, quoting various canonists and moralists on either side. Henriquez, S.J., is for the milder opinion, but is opposed by Sanchez, S.J., whose opinion is given at length. Bellarmin, Laymann, Illsung, and Andreas Vallensis are on the milder side, and Gonzalez, Tellez, Engel, la Croix, Schmalzgrueber are in opposition. Reiffenstuel favored different sides at different times. The practical conclusion is that without a *repromissio* the impediment in question is doubtful and therefore is to be treated as no impediment.—In the same magazine, P. Kneller considers the question of St. Peter being Bishop of Rome, taking issue with Lightfoot and Harnack. Arguments are drawn from the various catalogues and from passages in the Fathers, to show that, not only in the fourth century but also long before, St. Peter's relationship to the Roman Church was considered to be that of a bishop to his flock.

[29] *L. c.*, p. 9 f.
[30] *Études*, February 3, 1902, p. 349 ff.
[31] *Cf. Revue canonique*, May–June, 1901, p. 424 ff.

In the *Revue du Clergé Français* (Feb. 15) P. Batiffol relates the various recent controversies stirred up by Mr. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession*. The first French critic of the book was P. Boudinhon,[1] who recognized the copiousness of Mr. Lea's information, but complained of his want of thoroughness and scientific method. P. Boudinhon left himself open, however, to some of the same criticisms he had passed on Mr. Lea, for his article failed to present a clear and well-divided study of the various points in question. P. Brucker, S.J.,[2] soon undertook a criticism of P. Boudinhon, but did not altogether do justice to him; and although some of P. Brucker's points were well taken, his treatment of the question was not satisfactory. Then P. Vacandard began to treat the penitential discipline,[3] and commenced his work with translating P. Funk's article in the *Kirchenlexikon*, although he could have found much better material in French books. P. Vacandard's analysis and criticism of Mr. Lea's book were good, for he exposed the underlying error, namely, the supposition that in the first centuries there was no form of penance except public and purely disciplinary penance; still in other respects, P. Vacandard was somewhat inexact and inconsistent. P. Harent, S.J., was the next who wrote,[4] but he was not very fortunate, for in differing from P. Vacandard he assumed positions which could not be sustained. Another writer was the recently deceased P. Hogan.[5] He criticised Mr. Lea severely and properly; but his exposition fails to be perfectly satisfactory, omitting as it does certain information with regard to the second and the third century. In conclusion we may say that the principles which stand out as a result of these studies are the same as what Petavius taught. The same magazine reprints Dom Mackey's paper on the Ideal Seminary according to St. Francis de Sales,—being a translation of an article prepared for THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.[6]

In our February issue we noted a discussion over the nature

[1] *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, 1896, p. 307.

[2] *Études*, October 5, 1897.

[3] *Revue du Clergé Français*, 1898, 1er avril; 1er mai; 1er juillet; 1er sept.; 1er nov.; 1899, 1er fev.; 1er mars.

[4] *Études*, 1899.

[5] *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, July, 1900.

[6] *Cf.* Vol. xxiii, July, 1900, pp. 1–16.

of faith, in the pages of the *Revue du Clergé Français*. In the *Revue* of February 1, P. Péchegut defends himself against the criticisms of P. Gayraud (December 15). P. Gayraud now replies (February 15), that the error of the neo-apologists is in their denying not the relative but the absolute incapacity of "the Vatican method"; and that he protests against this as well as against certain statements of P. Péchegut calling faith a "faculty," and denying the intrinsic sufficiency of the motives of credibility as a basis for faith.—In the *Revue* of February 1, P. Ermoni presented a summary but comprehensive view of the question between the new and the old apologetic, his remarks being occasioned by P. Maisonneuve's article "Apologétique" in the sixth number of Vacant's *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*. The *Revue* (February 15) also publishes an interesting correspondence between P. Péchegut and M. Maurice Blondel, concerned with the efficacy of the new method. Reference is made to M. Blondel's long promised and impatiently awaited work on *L'Apologétique*.—P. Ermoni also comments upon the article "Symbole des Apôtres," by PP. Batiffol and Vacant. Recently, in the *Revue Historique* (July 1, 1901), an interesting discussion on this matter was carried on between P. Vacandard and Dom Chamard, the latter sustaining the thesis that the Creed was really formulated by the Apostles; and that, moreover, the question is not a purely historical but a dogmatic one. That the Apostles actually invented the text of the Creed can scarcely be proved historically, however. P. Ermoni also mentions P. Turmel's recent articles on Original Sin in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, and praises the writer's learning, honesty, independence, and critical spirit. P. Ermoni agrees with him that "in the Apostolic Fathers we find no trace of this dogma."

In the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne* (February), M. Gasc-Desfosses, reviewing Nicolay's recent book,[7] declares that two great ideas made clear in this immense and valuable book are these: that in the matter of legislation and punishment the Church has been less rigorous than the State; and that the belief in a primitive revelation is universal. The purpose of the work is

[7] *Histoire des croyances, superstitions, mœurs, usages et coutumes*. Paris: Retaux.

to show the essentially religious nature of man.—In the same issue, P. Denis concludes his "Lessons of the Present Hour," by publishing his Preface; and traces the existence of actual conditions to "a general state of mind gradually resulting from clerical education being formed on a plan alien to the needs of the age."

In *La Science Catholique* (February), P. Michel, while praising "the historical method" in theology and recognizing the good work done by its representatives, takes exception to the tendencies of certain writers, and in particular to the recent review of Bardenhewer's *Patrology*, made by P. Lenain in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*. P. Michel states that the reviewer omitted part of his duty by failing to establish the true meaning of certain Patristic texts which seem to depart from orthodoxy. "It would be intolerable for a Catholic reader to remain under the painful impression that the great Christian truths were more or less contested by the Doctors of the faith in the first ages."—The same magazine contains another interesting paper by P. Fontaine. Some three or four years ago P. Martin published a volume called *La Démonstration philosophique*. The book was so strongly assailed by ecclesiastical critics that it was withdrawn from circulation by its author in order to avoid "des ennuis"; but afterwards he published a volume on St. Augustine, aiming at showing that Father to have held the very doctrines reprobated by the critics. In the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne* (May 1, 1901), P. Grosjean commended this volume in terms of high praise. P. Grosjean's article and P. Martin's book are now written up by P. Fontaine under the title "Kantian and Protestant Infiltrations," in *La Science Catholique* (February).

In the *Divus Thomas* (fasc. 1) P. N. del Prado continues his *Lectiones de gratia*, dealing with the teaching of St. Thomas on the possibility and the conditions of merit. P. Fargues, continuing a paper on the proofs of the existence of God, discusses the possibility of reducing the various arguments to logical unity, and declares that all the nine arguments advanced may be logically reduced to the principle of causality.

In the *Revue Thomiste* (January) P. Mandonnet continues his article, already noticed in our pages (May and November 1901),

concerning the decree of Innocent XI against the teaching of Probabilism by the Jesuits; the present contribution is concerned with the troubles between the Pope and the French Jesuits, and presents the writer's reasons for believing that P. Oliva, the General of the Jesuits, did not positively conform to the decree in question.—In the same magazine, P. Montagne advances quotations from Saint Thomas and various reasons to prove that the monarchical form of government is preferable to the republican. —P. Blanc and C. de Kirwan correspond concerning transformism and, while agreeing that spiritualist evolutionism is not in conflict with Christian dogma, they disagree as to the question whether the principle of evolution can be rejected *a priori*.

The (Anglican) *Church Quarterly Review* (January) continues an historical inquiry, begun in July of last year, as to the theology of the Holy Eucharist. The first section of the article showed that "the theology taught by the Fathers, while not expressly defining the relation of the elements to the Body and Blood of Christ, or the exact nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, clearly affirmed that the consecrated bread and wine are Christ's Body and Blood, and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and is intimately connected with what Christ suffered and did on the cross and does in Heaven." The second part showed that "no detailed explanations of the Eucharistic Sacrifice are found in the West in the Middle Ages, though the tendency of the schoolmen was to connect it with the cross and death of Christ, and that of the liturgical writers was to associate it more markedly with the Heavenly offering." The second part noted also that after the controversies of the ninth and following centuries "the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ was affirmed by Peter Lombard in less materialistic language than had previously been used,—the bread and wine were said to be 'transubstantiated' into the Body and Blood of Christ in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council, and the Scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation was elaborated and explained by St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century." This present part of the inquiry touches upon the doctrine in the East during the Middle Ages, and upon the differences between St. Thomas and Duns Scotus, and aims at showing that at the

close of the Middle Ages the Church entered upon a period of controversy, hampered with regard to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice by failure to remember the Patristic teaching about the connection of the offering of the Church upon earth with the action of our Lord in Heaven, and hampered as to the doctrine of the Real Presence by being committed so strongly to a certain philosophical explanation of transubstantiation.

In *Studi Religiosi* (January–February) P. Semeria publishes a chapter from his forthcoming volume, *Dogma, Gerarchia, e Culto nella Chiesa Primitiva.* Speaking of the Apostles' Creed, he rejects as legendary the account of its Apostolic origin, first broached by Rufinus about 400 A. D., and enlarged in an uncritical way until the eighth century, when the articles began to be assigned one to each of the Apostles. The Greeks at the Council of Florence declared they recognized no Apostles' Creed. As stated by Harnack, the Creed first appeared in the second century; although in substance it is of Apostolic origin, being built upon I Tim. 6: 13; II Tim. 2: 8; 4: 1; I Ep. Joan. 4: 15; 5: 5; Acts 8: 36–38. In the fourth century it was in use as a baptismal formula. Dr. Brown, the Anglican, is probably correct in thinking that the *textus receptus* is the Roman Creed of the second century enlarged in the course of centuries.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* (January 4) outlines the teaching of the Church on divorce, in view of the recent movement in Italy to legalize divorce. The article follows the texts of the Papal Allocution on the subject. Divorce is inconsistent with the idea of matrimony as a divine institution for continuing the creative and conservative action of God on the human race. Marriage is a natural contract, based upon and determined by nature, but nevertheless differing from all other contracts in being concerned with the disposition of that over which man has not dominion, and in antedating society. The moral unity of persons resulting from the matrimonial contract is destroyed, or at least, weakened, by the legalizing of divorce. Moreover, Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament, insisting upon monogamy, and recalling it to its original indissolubility. Hence the proposed law is a grave injury to the Christian religion, since every marriage between Christians is now a sacrament and civil interference with

it is sacrilegious. Divorce, moreover, offends the Christian sense, as may be seen in those lands where it is established by law; and it tends further to widen the breach between Church and State, for the Church will never consent to any compromise on the question. Nor will it be of any avail to introduce into the law certain provisions intended to render it less hurtful.

PHILOSOPHY.

With the Ancient Sages.

LAST month we lingered awhile with the gentle mystic of hoary China, to learn his final word on Being, Life, and Conduct. Not a satisfying word it was to us at least who are the heirs to the ages' wisdom illumined by the Incarnate Word. Pantheism in metaphysics and a mystical quietism in ethics sum up the philosophy of Lâo-Tsze—his wisdom as a thinker and his counsel as a teacher. It is, however, but just to the venerable philosopher to mention that so eminent a sinologist as M. de Harlez finds it possible to give the *Tâo-te-King*, the work in which Lâo-Tsze's teaching is set forth, a theistic interpretation. By *Tâo*, he claims, is meant the One, Absolute, Eternal Being, that is, God; and though Lâo-Tsze is not clear in his account of the origin of things—whether they proceed from Tâo by emanation or by creation—in any case by emanation is meant "a production which places contingent beings entirely outside the divine substance."[1] The ethics, likewise, receive a kindly interpretation under the comment of the learned Louvain professor.

Lâo-Tsze left a host of disciples, who, however, substituted for their master's metaphysics a cloud of superstitious legends, so that the works of the Tâoists are taken up largely with alchemy, amulets, the philosopher's stone, sacrifices, incantations, and the like.

Before Lâo-Tsze passed from life he was visited by his illustrious countryman *Kong-futsze* (Confucius), then his junior by half a century. The details of the dialogue recorded by Sz'-Ma-Ts'ien, the biographer of the elder sage, are highly interesting as

[1] *Dublin Review*, July, 1887, p. 39.

well as edifying. Confucius was overawed with reverence for the wisdom of the ancients. Lâo-Tsze said:

"Lord, of whom you speak, the men and their bones, I suppose, have altogether rotted away. Their words only are still extant. Moreover, if a sage find his time, he rises; if he does not find his time, he wanders about like a P'ung plant [a plant growing on the sand and easily carried about by the wind]. I have heard, a wise merchant hides [his treasures] deeply, as if [his house or safe] were empty. A sage of perfect virtue gives himself the appearance as though [he were] simple-minded, *yü*."

"Give up your proud spirit, your many wishes, your external appearance with your exaggerated plans. These all are of no advantage to the sage's person. This is what I have to communicate to you, sir; that is all."

Sz'-Ma-Ts'ien continues:

"Confucius went; and said to his disciples: 'Of the birds I know that they can fly, of the fishes I know that they can swim, of the beasts I know that they can run. For the running, one makes nooses; for the swimming, one makes nets; for the flying, one makes arrows. As to the dragon, I do not know how he rides upon wind and clouds up to heaven. To-day I saw Lâo-Tsze. Is he, perhaps, like the dragon?'"[2]

This simple dialogue illustrates the character of the two philosophers. The older was dreamy, idealistic, mystical; the younger was matter-of-fact, realistic, sceptical.

Opposite evaluations have been made of the work of Confucius. Some place him first amongst the ancient moralists, the heir, indeed, of the primal revelation; others regard him as the corruptor of the Chinese. Some credit him with a systematic theory of life; others make him a mere purveyor of traditional maxims and adages. Here, as often elsewhere, the truth lies in the middle.

"Kong-futsze is, in truth, a great moralist, a man of large heart, and his teachings have propagated and perpetuated many admirable maxims which have certainly produced great acts of virtue. But in systematically removing from these teachings all notion of reference to God, of duty to Him, he uprooted the whole basis of morality, and destroyed in the people the religious sentiment which alone can render adhesion to moral principles interior and sincere. In this way the great philosopher destroyed religion in China, prepared that state of external virtue which conceals the most dangerous of internal vices and opens the door to all sorts of superstitions with a people that is credulous and eager for the supernatural. In this way Kong-futsze really perverted the nation and corrupted all morality and virtue at its very source. On the other hand, Kong-futsze's ideas were not exclusively his own. He was, and

[2] *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 53. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co. 1898.

constantly professed to be, the principal restorer of morality and ancient maxims; he did not formulate a complete and methodical system. But although incomplete and drawn from the traditions of his nation, his teaching, none the less, constituted a system, and with him in his own mind certainly, the maxims which he left to his disciples were based on a principle and had a well-defined connection one with the other, although he has not made known to us in what way. Hence, we are quite right in speaking of the 'system' of Confucius." [3]

What then was this system? First of all it should be noted that, like Socrates, with whom in life and thought and aim he had so much in common, Confucius wrote no philosophy. His disciples took down his exact words, and these were carefully transmitted to posterity in three books, the *Tâ-hsîo* ("the Great Learning), the *Kung-Yung* ("the mean, the interior Calm"), and the *Lun-Yü* ("the Conferences"). The first two contain on the whole direct teachings; the third, questions put to the master and answered by him.

Confucius seemed to have had a single aim in life, the reformation of the people in head and members, the governing and the governed. He realized the beauty of virtue and the value of example, but his teaching was throughout merely naturalistic. He recognized no duties of man to God, and had no appreciation of a divine basis and sanction of law. Though probably believing in God—*Shang-ti*—he excluded Him from his teaching and thus accustomed his followers to ignore God's existence.

He has no certain principles on the nature and origin of man. Man like all things else is a production of Heaven and Earth, the highest expression of their power, their equal. He believes in the survival of the soul after death; but this immortality is not a retribution, a moral sanction. The soul, apart from its terrestrial merits, becomes a sort of *genius* for the family; and him must his descendants worship so as to retain him in bliss.

Confucius was first and last a moralist. He grouped his teachings under the following heads: "the formation of the intelligence by the study of truth; the reform and strengthening of the heart; self-possession and self-guidance; government of the family and the empire; the happiness and peace assured to the world." All this constitutes the way of the superior man and results in the good government of the empire. Confucius wrought

[3] Mgr. C. de Harlez. *Dublin Review*, July, 1887, p. 43.

it out into immense detail, applying it to the minutest guidance of self, the family, and the State.

A typical illustration of the ethical teachings of Confucius will be found in *The Great Plan*, a portion of the *Shû-King*,[4] one of the sacred books edited by him. The *Great Plan* means the great model of government, the method of rendering the people content and happy through the perfect example of the king and his perfect administration. The introduction states that God delivered it to Yü, the son of Khwân, though its date is uncertain. P. Gaubil says that "it is a treatise at once of metaphysics, astrology, divination, morals, politics and religion, and that it has a sufficiently close resemblance to the work of Ocellus, the Lucanian." It is somewhat suggestive of the Pythagorian teaching; but the contrast between the speculative mind of the Greek and the practical sense of the Chinese is more apparent. Where the Chinese writer loses himself in the sheerest follies of fantasy, he yet gropes about for a rule of practical conduct. Out of the nine sections into which the *Great Plan* is divided we select those pertinent to our present purpose.

"The second division deals with the five (personal) matters. The first is the bodily demeanor; the second, speech; the third, seeing; the

[4] The Sacred Books of China and the Chinese Classics may be arranged as follows:

A. The Five *King*. (King means a web of cloth, or the warp which keeps the threads in their place.)
   (a) *Yih-King*. (Changes.)
   (b) *Shû-King*. (History.)
   (c) *Shih-King*. (Odes.)
   (d) *Lî-Kî-King*. (Rites.)
   (e) *Kuhn Khiû*. (Spring and Autumn. Annals from B. C. 722 to 481.)

B. The Four Books.
   (a) *Lun-Yü*. (Analects, or Table-Talk of Confucius.)
   (b) *Tâ-Hsio*. (Great Learning. Written by *Tsang-Sie*, a disciple of Confucius.)
   (c) *Kung-Yung* (or Doctrine of the Mean), ascribed to *Zse-Sze*, the grandson of Confucius.
   (d) Works of *Mencius*.

After the death of Confucius there was a period in which the Sacred Books were much corrupted, down to the *Han* dynasty (B. C. 201 to A. D. 24), which collected, edited, and revised them; since which time they have been watched with the greatest care.—*S. Books of the East*. Vol. III.

fourth, hearing; the fifth, thinking. (The virtue of) the bodily appearance is respectfulness; of speech, accordance (with reason); of seeing, clearness; of hearing, distinctness; of thinking, perspicaciousness. The respectfulness becomes manifest in gravity; accordance (with reason), in orderliness; the clearness, in wisdom; the distinctness, in deliberation; and the perspicaciousness, in sageness.

"The third division treats of the 'eight objects of government.' The first is food; the second, wealth and articles of convenience; the third, sacrifices; the fourth, (the business of) the Minister of Works; the fifth, (that of) the Minister of Instruction; the sixth, (that of) the Minister of Crime; the seventh, the observances to be paid to guests; the eighth, the army.

"The fifth, of 'royal perfection.' The sovereign having established (in himself) the highest degree and pattern of excellence, concentrates in his own person the five (sources of) happiness, and proceeds to diffuse them, and give them to the multitudes of the people. Then they, on their part, embodying your perfection, will give it back to you, and secure the preservation of it. Among all the multitudes of the people there will be no unlawful confederacies, and among men (in office) there will be no bad and selfish combinations;—let the sovereign establish in (himself) the highest degree and pattern of excellence.

"Among all the multitudes of the people there will be those who have ability to plan and to act, and who will keep themselves (from evil):—do you keep such a mind; and there will be those who, not coming up to the highest point of excellence, yet do not involve themselves in evil:—let the sovereign receive such. And when a placid satisfaction appears in their countenances, they say, 'Our love is fixed on virtue,' do you then confer favors on them:—those men will in this way advance to the perfection of the sovereign. Do not let him oppress the friendless and the childless, nor let him fear the high and distinguished. When men (in office) have ability and administrative power, let them be made still more to cultivate their conduct; and the prosperity of the country will be promoted. All (such) right men, having a competency, will go on in goodness. If you cannot cause them to have what they love in their families, they will forthwith proceed to be guilty of crime. As to those who have not the love of virtue, although you confer favors (and emoluments) on them, they will (only) involve you in the guilt of employing evil.

"He [the Count of Khi] went on to say, 'This amplification of

the royal perfection contains the unchanging (rule), and is the (great) lesson ;—yea, it is the lesson of God. All the multitudes of the people, instructed in this amplification of the perfect excellence, and carrying it into practice, will thereby approximate to the glory of the Son of Heaven, and say the Son of Heaven is the parent of the people, and so become the sovereign of all under the sky.'

"The sixth, of the 'three virtues.'—The first is correctness and straightforwardness; the second, strong rule; and the third, mild rule. In peace and tranquillity, correctness and straightforwardness (must sway); in violence and disorder, strong rule; in harmony and order, mild rule. For the reserved and retiring there should be (the stimulus of) the strong rule; for the high-minded and distinguished, the restraint of the mild rule."

We make room for two appreciations of Confucian ethics by scholars eminently qualified to judge in this matter. The first is that of Mr. Edgar Quinet in his *Le Génie des Religions*, c. 7:

"At the other end of the world a society is discovered whose principles are equality of all its members, intellect the sole ground of preëminence, personal merit the sole aristocracy. Everything there is exactly measured, calculated, weighed, by the laws of human nature; its one great idol is good sense. But as soon as these marvels have aroused the admiration of the West, comes the discovery that this wonderful people neither breathes, nor moves, nor lives, and that all this wisdom has only ended in creating a sublime automaton. Why? Because man is there deprived of an ideal superior to himself. In Chinese society, man being his own end finds his goal in his starting-point: he cannot escape being stifled within the narrow limits of humanity. In this dwarf society, everything is deprived of its crown. Morality wants heroism; royalty, its royal muse; verse, poetry; philosophy, metaphysics; life, immortality; because, above all, God is wanting.'

To this may be added the following from M. de Harlez:

"Setting aside spirits, never speaking of God, but only—and that in very rare cases—of Heaven, taken in a vague acceptation; checking all inquiry into the fate of the soul after death, Kong-futze created a system of ethics purely human. Without other foundation than convenience, the beauty of principles, the effects of their observance upon destinies here below, this morality without God led the Chinese into a veritable practical atheism, weakened characters, and produced a vast system of hypocrisy which hides the most shameful vices under the cloak of the purest of virtues. Grand maxims and low, corrupt morals, such is the principal result of this system. Whilst, on the one hand, the Chinese troubles himself about the rules of a civility more than childish, often in fact ridiculous, he is little concerned at deceiving and oppressing those whom he can."

On the other hand, as Greek philosophy was "a pedagogue to bring men to Christ," may it not be that, as James Freeman Clark suggests, the truth and purity in the teachings of Confucius were

providentially intended to lead this great nation in the right direction; that Confucius was a Star in the East to lead his people to Christ? One of the most authentic of his sayings is this, that "in the West the true saint must be looked for and found." He had a perception, such as truly great men have often had, of some one higher than himself who was to come after him. May it not, therefore, be that God, who forgets none of His children, has given this teacher to the swarming millions of China to lead them on till they are ready for a higher light? At all events, as Mr. Clark[5] observes, the temporal prosperity and external virtues of this nation and their long-continued stability amid the universal changes of the world are due in no small degree to the lessons of reverence for the past, of respect for knowledge, of peace and order, and especially filial piety, which Confucuis inculcated. In them has been fulfilled the divine promise: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

With the Recent Philosophers.

To pass from the rigid formalism of Confucian ethics, to the untrammeled, free-as-the-air speculation of modern idealism and evolutionism is like turning from the picture-forms of the Chinese characters to the cursive lines and flections of our own free and easy English script. One feels this contrast in matter and method when one takes a work such as Professor Royce's *The World and the Individual*.[6] It reminds one of the deepest undergrowth of a tropical forest. The thought is dense, intertwined, intermatted, luxuriant,—replete, however, with many a beauteous form, and revealing hidden symmetry and departments of order to those whose eyes are used to the twilight. The task which Professor Royce has undertaken "is to show what we mean by Being in general and what by the special sorts of reality that we attribute to God, to the world, and to the human individual" (p. 11). His work therefore contains an Ontology of Natural Religion. He mentions three conceptions of natural religion. The first is a search for God through nature. The student having accepted

[5] *Ten Great Religions*, Vol. I, p. 59.

[6] *The World and the Individual*. By Professor Royce. The Macmillan Company. Vol. I, 1900. Vol. II, 1902.

the natural knowledge of his time as valid and not having attempted to delve beneath the foundations of that knowledge, seeks to interpret nature in the light of religious interests. The second views natural religion less as a doctrine to be proved or disproved through a study of the external world, than as a kind of consciousness whose justification lies in its rank amongst the various manifestations of our human nature; it is the voice of human nature whose faith is to be expressed, whose ideals are to be recorded, whose will and whose needs are to be, above all, consulted and portrayed. The third view identifies natural religion with the fundamental philosophy of religion. Here the student has to examine the most fundamental problems of metaphysics. It is the author's object to deal with this, the most neglected and arduous of the methods of studying the relations between religion and the ultimate problems of the theory of Being (I, pp. 3–5).

The well-informed reader at this point may justly take exception to the above tripartite division. A fourth member has obviously been omitted, viz., that which seeks the way through nature to God, not by "*accepting* the natural knowledge of the time as valid, or without having attempted to delve beneath the foundation of that knowledge," but precisely *after* having attempted this delving process. This is the conception and method familiar to every student of scholastic philosophy, in which the ultimate ontological concepts are thoroughly probed in order to lay a firm basis for the science of nature, of man, and of God, and with an ulterior view of giving a valid foundation to the science of religion. Since the concept of Being underlies all science, that of religion included, Professor Royce analyzes this concept with much care and no little subtlety. He lays bare four of its acceptations. The first is the realistic. For this conception, Being is that which is *independent* of the mere ideas that relate or that may relate to it. For this view what is, is not only external to our *ideas* of it, but absolutely and independently decides as to the validity of such ideas. "What we merely think makes no difference to fact." The second is the *mystical* conception. For it Being is that which is absolutely and finally *immediate*, the longed-for goal of desire, that which, when felt, excludes ideal definition and in this sense satisfies ideas as well as

constitutes the fact. The third conception may be called the empirico-rationalistic. For it Being is that which is purely and simply valid or true, that which experience in verifying our ideas shows to be valid therein. The real is the valid "possibility of experience." The fourth is what the author calls synthetic or the constructively idealistic. For it Being is that which finally presents in a completed experience the whole meaning of a system of ideas (I, pp. 60, 61). It is this fourth conception of Being which underlies the author's entire system. From the viewpoint of *constructive idealism* he determines the manner of Being that should be attributed to the world, to man, and to God. What then is *constructive idealism*, and what is its message? We find in the present work no succinct answer to either member of this double query. Probably we may get a clearer notion by consulting *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, a work in which the author has set forth his system in a more popular form. The following passages contain the briefest summary we have been able to find or to construct of the matter:

"Of no object do I speak either falsely or truly, unless I mean that object. Never do I mean an object, unless I stand in such relation thereto that were the object in this conscious moment and immediately present to me, I should myself recognize it as completing and fulfilling my present and momentary meaning. The relation of meaning an object is thus one that only conscious reflection can define, or observe, or constitute. . . . Therefore, when what is meant is outside of the moment which means, only a self inclusive of the moment and its object could complete, and so confirm or refute the opinion that the moment contains. Really to mean an object, then, whether in case of true opinion or in case of false opinion, involves the real possibility of such a reflective test of one's meaning from the point of view of a larger self. But to say, My relation to the object is such that a reflective larger self, and *only* such a reflective and inclusive self, could see that I meant the object, is to assert a fact, a relation, an existent truth in the world, that either is a truth for nobody, or is a truth for an actual reflective self, inclusive of the moment, and critical of its meaning. . . . Hence whoever believes, whether truly or falsely, about objects beyond the moment of his belief, is an organic part of a reflective and conscious larger self that has those objects immediately present to itself, and has them in organic relation with the erring or truthful momentary self that believes."

Now we cannot escape this larger Self.

"We are lost and imprisoned in the thickets of its tangled labyrinth. The moments are not at all in themselves, for as moments they have no meaning; they exist only in relation to the beyond. The larger Self alone is, and they are by reason of it, organic parts. They perish, but it remains; they have truth or error only in its overshadowing presence."

Moreover, this Self is and must be just one.

"Nay, were there *many* such, would not their manifoldness be a truth? Their relations, would not these be real? Their distinct places in the world-order, would not these things be objects of possible true or false thoughts? If so, must not there be once more the inclusive real Self for whom these truths were true, these separate selves interrelated, and their variety absorbed in the organism of its rational meaning? There is, then, at last, but one Self—organically, reflectively, consciously inclusive of all the selves—and so all truth. I have called this Self Logos, problem-solver, all-knower."

What, then, is the relation of the world of facts to this One?

"The world, then, is such stuff as ideas are made of. Thought possesses all things. But the world isn't unreal. It extends indefinitely beyond our private consciousness, because it is the world of a universal mind. What facts it is to contain only experience can inform us. There is no magic that can anticipate the work of science. Absolutely the *only* thing sure from the first about this world, however, is that it is intelligent, rational, orderly, essentially comprehensible, so that all its problems are somewhere solved, all its dark mysteries are known to the supreme self."

Man's ontological relation to the supreme Self is indicated in the closing lines of Professor Royce's latest volume:

"Despite God's absolute unity, we, as individuals, preserve and attain our unique lives and meanings, and are not lost in the very life that sustains us, and that needs us as its own expression. This life is real through us all; and we are real through our union with that life. Close is our touch with the eternal. Boundless is the meaning of our nature. Its mysteries baffle our present science and escape our present experience; but they need not blind our eyes to the central unity of Being, nor make us feel lost in a realm where all the wanderings of time mean the process whereby is discovered the homeland of eternity."

It can hardly be expected that these extracts will convey a perfectly clear concept to the reader who is accustomed to look at things from the standpoint of common sense. Indeed, even those who have been trained to follow the subtleties of modern idealism may find it difficult to discern much that the author adduces. This is likely to be the case particularly in respect to what Professor Royce declares to be the "one lesson" of his lectures, "the lesson of the unity of finite and infinite, of temporal dependence and of eternal significance, of the World and of all individuals, of the One and the Many, of God and of Man" (II, p. 417). On the surface this is pantheism. We should be loath, however, to believe that the one lesson which the leading professor of philosophy in the foremost centre of learning in America brought to the University of Aberdeen, in answer to the character of the Gifford lectureship on Natural Religion, was the

lesson of pantheism. Professor Royce's keen mind—there is none keener—doubtless sees and means certain distinctions that are evidently demanded in order to save the Theistic validity of his philosophy.

The dominant note of the *moral philosophy* taught at Harvard is definite and firm, if we may judge of it from Professor Palmer's little volume, *The Field of Ethics*.[1] His purpose is to determine the place of ethics in a rational scheme of the universe (p. 3). The plan is a demarcation of the field of ethics by means of a series of graded contrasts. Assuming the notion of ethics as the science of conduct and character, the author shows how this definition differentiates ethics from the physical sciences, from the other philosophical sciences, from history, law, and æsthetics (p. 4). Three of the six lectures are devoted to these subjects. The next two are given to the relations of ethics to religion. A brief conclusion states the differentiation of ethics from the opinions of everyday life. The outcome of the discussion is an answer to the question, What sort of being is capable of conduct and character, and therefore requires the science of ethics to explain him? The answer is presented in the following scheme:

"Ethics deals with a human being who is conceived as unlike the being of—

1. Physics, through being conscious	Spirit.	Ego or Self.
2. Philosophy, through being active		
3. History, through being free		
4. Law, through possessing subjective worth	Person.	
5. Æsthetics, through possessing objective worth		
6. Religion, through being finite	Individual.	
7. Common Life, through being coherent"		

The scholastic student glancing at this table and at some other minutiae of the book might be tempted to criticize certain terms and details. On closer reading, however, the temptation will melt away before the open candor, the simplicity, the gentleness which make the atmosphere of the author's thought. The merit of the work lies not in its depth and erudition, but in the varied insights and outlooks it presents and suggests and in the perfect transparency of its form and style.

[1] *The Field of Ethics*, by George H. Palmer. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1901.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE MASTERY OF THE PACIFIC. By Archibald R. Colquhoun, author of "China in Transformation," etc. With special Maps, Frontispiece, and more than one hundred Illustrations from Original Sketches and Photographs. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. 440.

Mr. Colquhoun, who is an experienced traveller, a man of affairs, and a keen observer of ethical and political tendencies, does not hesitate to avow the conviction that the main struggles of the great national powers during the twentieth century will find their focus in the region of the Pacific. This conviction has led him to study the territorial, industrial, and political conditions of the American and Asiatic Pacific coastlands, and later on of Australia, together with the many islands which represent the possessions of the United States, Great Britain, Holland, and Japan in the Pacific region. The present volume embodies the conclusions of Mr. Colquhoun's studies and observations. The Pacific possessions of the nations which are the chief colonial powers in the far East, are discussed in four chapters. To the remaining powers, Germany, France, Russia, and China, which are secondarily though directly interested in the government of the eastern world, the author devotes a single chapter. The introduction gives us a general outline of the past history of the peoples living in the territories described.

The work does not lay special claim to scientific or historical scholarship. It merely purposes to present a vivid impression of the various countries—their peoples, scenery, social and political life, and the parts they are destined to play "in the great drama of the mastery of the Pacific." And what is the result at which we arrive as to the probable trend of future events? The author plainly allows us to infer that the future control of the Pacific depends mainly on the action of the United States, which not only has her hand within reach of the rudder that directs, but upon the machinery which controls the political as well as the commercial interests of the Pacific countries. In the author's opinion Japan is perhaps the most important factor in the settlement of affairs which cannot be done without further strug-

gle. But the struggle need not involve the shedding of blood, only forethought, preparation, and sustained effort in the direction of a clearly outlined policy.

Regarding the vexed question of the Friars, the author explains that from the beginning the priests exercised paramount influence throughout all the Spanish possessions over the mass of the people. They were practically the only trusted emissaries and executives of the government, from whom it derived its information, and who therefore dictated its policy in the management of a remote and strange people which was accessible only to such influences as religion could command, even if we might suppose that Spanish officials at home cared for preferment in the foreign provinces where they had to expose themselves to conditions which self-sacrificing missionaries might readily accept but which were precarious otherwise. The control which the clergy, especially the regulars, exercised, was therefore a natural result of missionary activity, all the more so as there was a real absence of home care for these Islands. In course of time, therefore, the people began to look upon the clergy or the friars as the ordinary representatives of the Spanish crown to which they owed loyalty. And with this peaceful guardianship of the friars there was no need of any armed force to protect the Spanish rights. "Give me forty priests instead," was the answer of the Governor to the proposal to have a military garrison for the use of the Islands. This was well enough so long as there was no contrary influence at work in the Islands. But with the opening of the Suez Canal and the consequently increased facility of communication between the home country and the Islands, there came a great change. A horde of Spanish place-hunters poured into the Islands, bribes were freely offered and accepted for government positions, until the systematic corruption and greed after spoil began to weigh heavily upon the natives. As these had been accustomed to look upon the friars as the representatives of Spanish rule, so they now began to blame the friars for the new turn of things, all the more as the civil authorities fostered this prejudice; while the independence of the ecclesiastical element, which enjoyed its guaranteed revenues, gave emphasis to the discontent of the oppressed people. Our author does not wish, to use his own words, "to decry the work done by the Church in the Philippines. Many of the men sent out were earnest and devoted." But he believes that "others were not always worthy of their Order or the holy religion they took with them. It was an arduous mission, one that lasted for

life, but although many saintly men volunteered for it, a great many were merely the sweepings of Spanish monasteries" (p. 66). Altogether his verdict comes to this, that "the majority of the friars abused much of their power." From this charge he exempts the Jesuits, who consequently are less suspected and disliked by the natives. "Having once been banished on account of their interference in politics," he writes, "after their return they devoted themselves chiefly to education and science; and it is to them that we owe the greater part of our present knowledge of the Philippines, the charting of coasts, and many other useful works; while their world-famous observatory at Manila has been of the greatest service to sailors in these troubled seas, forecasts being telegraphed to different ports." These extracts will show that the author proposed to himself to take a fair and objective view of the things he describes; and yet here and there the lack of an inner view into the motives of Catholic activity distorts his judgment and leads him to make odious interpretation of what deserves a very different treatment at the hands of one who desires to be just to the accused. Thus he mentions the knowledge obtained through the confessional as giving the friars an unequal power over the natives. That may be true, and yet is not so in the sense in which our author suggests it, as a lever of political ascendency. To the reflecting student of the conditions in the countries described it must be evident that if the clergy, as in the case of the Jesuits, did such educational and industrial work as the author instances, they must have, by the very condition of things, obtained a certain right and at the same time immunity from the interference of less competent political influence, which would be equivalent to political influence on their part. If the Manila observatory, to take a patent case in point, was to become an efficient service for public good by protecting vessels, and hence commerce, was it not essential that those who were alone capable of managing such safety-means should enjoy a certain freedom such as might be construed into that political power which is advanced as a charge against those who never sought such power for any other purpose than that of benefiting the people whom they had devoted their lives to civilize and Christianize? That is a view that the historian need take into consideration, if he would be thoroughly just. That there were and are unworthy friars who abuse the influence legitimately acquired and intended for the common good, no one need disclaim in order to justify the cause of religion; but that such a fact could ever vitiate the institution which is being decried, or that the possessions of

the friars were not intended and, on the whole, always used, for the benefit of the people whom the friars served even while they claimed to control, is an undeniable fact easily recognized, except for the general assumption in the public mind that the Catholic Church is in the wrong and that she may at best be but tolerated for the occasional good she urges. How very differently things will be seen if we take the bird's-eye view from above, and measure her work in all its proportions.

LEHRBUCH DER RELIGION. Ein Handbuch zu Deharbe's katholischem Katechismus und ein Lesebuch zum Selbstunterrichte. Von W. Wilmers, S.J. Sechste verbesserte Auflage, herausgegeben von Aug. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Erster Band: Lehre vom Glauben. Münster: Aschendorff. 1902. Pp. 698.

A work which is the outcome of nearly fifty years repeated and conscientious revision on the part of its author, must bear the marks of unusual perfection. It is literally true that the saintly Father Wilmers issued the first edition of this volume half a century ago, when already in the maturity of his profession, and with considerable experience as a catechist and teacher in theology, having, so to say, concentrated all his previous energy upon this branch of Christian teaching. He had entered the Society of Jesus before he had reached the age of eighteen, in 1834. After his ordination he taught philosophy and theology, and in the early 'fifties published his *Lehrbuch* in four volumes. Since then the work has been under his hands up to his old age; and he left it at his death, a year ago, with some final corrections. Accordingly the present (sixth) edition required, as Father Lehmkuhl, who writes the appreciative preface, tells us, no changes, although for the sake of clearness a few notes have been added here and there by the editor.

It is hardly necessary here to recall the detailed merits of Father Wilmers' text-book, one of many in the same line of studies which have already won a permanent reputation for the completeness and the lucidity in the matter of exposition of Catholic truth. The topics of the present volume are: the Purpose of Man's Creation, the Law of his Allegiance through the Rule of Faith, the Great Fundamental Dogmas of that Faith, namely, the Trinity and the Consequences of Man's Fall, together with his Rehabilitation,—which are treated in an exhaustive manner bringing into relief all the dogmatic phases of the subjects discussed. In controverted questions, Father Wilmers remains

usually on the conservative side. As to the descendence theory of Darwin, he maintains the Thomistic position of the *forma substantialis*, according to which the human body is essentially the casement of the soul, and could not have ever normally served any lower purpose. The editor, Father Lehmkuhl, while practically defending the same position, mentions the theory which assumes that God created the animal organism with the purpose and *germinal capacity* of a gradual development up to a point of superior animal sensitiveness, which might serve as a condition for the reception of faculties engendering that psychical activity which makes man a responsible being. Yet he states also his belief that this theory is based upon an imaginary and even impossible assumption, since a creature supposed to be a perfect animal, and nevertheless destined to be something above its own species of perfection, appears to him a monstrosity. We venture to think that this is stating the point with too much show of cogency. The question of perfectibility is one on which the imagination—quite a legitimate faculty—allows a good deal of liberty; and it is as difficult to state the limit to God's power, outside of self-contradiction, as it is to get into the facts of His original designs. To most minds that are not professionally educated the arguments of the metaphysician appeal only in a hazy way, if at all; and one cannot shake off the sensation of irritation when they are presented to us in apologetic defences of Christianity as if they settled all the practical difficulties which arise out of the assumptions, even legitimate, of science. All in all Catholics, no matter how intellectual they are, will hold to the simple theory of creation by the *fiat;* and since that theory is as a rule implicitly, if not explicitly, denied by those who quibble about the manner in which actual creation is supposed to have been evolved, we lose really nothing in our defence of the truth if we *transeat* or even admit what to many minds seems by analogy the evident process of creation—namely, that man's body is the final result of a germinal development that gradually rendered it fit for the reception of the psychical life and to which it readily adapted itself, thus becoming the *forma substantialis* which the scholastics assume was created by immediate divine act. It is true that the traditions of theologians are overwhelmingly on one side, while science furnishes really no definite data which would make the plausible arguments from analogy in nature and of perfectibility in general anything more than a conjecture which favors the materialistic tendency of our age. But the Church has defined nothing which settles the matter, and hence we

should be in favor of more scientific equity, or, better said, a less exclusive and rigorous limitation of this subject, if it must be discussed in a work of apologetics.

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY and Clergy List. Official. Quarterly. 1902. Complete edition. Milwaukee, Wis.: The M. H. Wiltzius Company. Pp. xlii—859—174—211.

The *Directory*, which comes to hand somewhat belated this year owing to setbacks in its mechanical preparation, increases in bulk and utility each year. The publishers have been well advised to reintroduce into this issue the topographical index, the omission of which must have been often missed from last year's volume. The register of places with references to the dioceses to which they belong and the alphabetical clergy list with page references make a serviceable guide for finding the whereabouts of pastors and assistants as well as the parishes and missions throughout the fourteen archdioceses and the seventy-three dioceses and vicariates of the United States. A new feature in this year's *Directory* is the register of the Diocese of Havana, and the summary for the Philippine Islands. Why, however, is Porto Rico omitted? And if the Island of Cuba can claim place in this annual, why give only the Diocese of Havana? In subsequent issues of the *Directory* it may be hoped that the information with regard to the Philippine Islands will be supplemented, and this portion extended so as to take in, besides Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, and our other territory acquired and to be acquired. Although it is a far cry to some of these possessions, it may be said that they are nearer home in a United States Directory than are "Great Britain and Ireland, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the German Empire and Switzerland," which are favored with more attention and greater space in these pages. To many, however, this section of the book will be of interest, even though from the nature of the case it cannot be quite up-to-date and accurate.

Turning to the general summary of ecclesiastical statistics and comparing the figures there given with those in the Directories of past years and with other similar compilations at hand, we must confess to a sense of disappointment, despite the *Directory's* official character and the manner of collecting its information. Thus, the Catholic population of the country for 1902 is set down as 10,976,757, an increase of only 191,968 over 1901; whereas 1901 showed a gain of 645,312 over 1900. The New York *Independent*, which used to pub-

lish yearly a survey of the statistics of the Churches in America, gave for the year 1897–1898 the total "Roman Catholic communicants" of the United States as 8,378,128, adding, "as the Roman Catholic Church includes children, a deduction is made, the result being approximate rather than absolute." At that time there were reported to be about 1,000,000 children in our schools, and it is only fair to suppose that the number of these who had not made their First Communion together with the baptized children not attending school would bring the membership of the Church to about 10,500,000. Although we do not know where the *Independent* got its figures, it will hardly be accused of "Romanizing tendencies" or suspected of padding the Catholic returns. But if we are to accept these figures as at least not too high, surely there has been an increase of more than 500,000 in the Church since 1897–1898. Again, if we go to the reports of the Congregation of the Propaganda, we find that as early as the year 1893 the number of Catholics in the United States was set down as 8,902,000, and in 1895, 10,000,000, or about one-sixth of the total population. From the same reports it is interesting to note that the Catholic population in 1790 was only one in every 107 of the total population, or 30,000 souls all told; in 1890, one in every 53 of the total population; in 1840 the Catholics numbered 3,500,000, being at that time one-seventh of the nation.

The number of priests in the United States to-day is given as 11,636, being 351 less than in January, 1901. This apparent decrease is on the side of the secular clergy, as the regulars show a gain of 34 over last year. If it is indeed true that the list of the deceased among the clergy during the past twelvemonth is higher than the list of those ordained during 1901, there is grave cause for alarm. But probably the relation of the figures is at fault, either through error in last year's reports or in this year's. The same is no doubt the case with the seeming low increase of the Church membership during 1901. Again, it is noted that the list of orphan asylums (244) and of charitable institutions (877) for 1902 is slightly less in each case than the corresponding figures for last year, yet there are more inmates in these institutions this year than in 1901. Could this difference arise from the closing of Catholic Indian schools? It is rare indeed that any of our religious or charitable institutions are closed, in the face of no matter what misfortune; but new foundations are of almost daily report in one part or another of this growing country.

However, our noticing discrepancies in this direction is not to be

taken as criticism, for we are too well aware of the vast difficulty of the undertaking to which the publishers have brought no little courage and painstaking, and in which they deserve the support and assistance of those on whom they must depend for full and accurate information.

THROUGH SCIENCE TO FAITH. By Newman Smyth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. x—282.

This volume embodies a course of lectures delivered by the author before the Lowell Institute during the winter of 1900–1901. It may be said to aim at doing for the living kingdoms what Josiah Cooke's well-known lectures before that Institute did so well for the mineral kingdom, that is, reveal the evidences of Divine Providence in nature.[1] Of course Mr. Cooke's position as Professor of Chemistry at Harvard lent a certain authority to his testimony for design in the sphere of nature to whose study his life was devoted,—an authority which the reading world hardly ever accords a clergyman, no matter what his acquaintance with natural science. None the less, Dr. Smyth's work manifests considerable personal observation of vital phenomena, careful interpretation and on the whole a just illative sense as well as large reading in the pertinent literature. A number of bibliographical references give a wider usefulness to the lectures. We notice a few points which might be worth considering in the preparation of a future edition. At page 11 we read: "Does created nature consist of separate realms, such as the inorganic and the organic, matter and mind, the natural and the spiritual, which are not bound together in any process of development?" There is some confusion here. Nature may and does consist of *distinct*, though not *separate*, realms, some of which may be bound together by a process of development, such as the inorganic and the organic. Other realms, such as matter and mind, are *distinct* and are not and in the nature of things cannot be bound together by any process of development. Elsewhere we read: "It is sober scientific physics which teaches us to find a constant sum of energy through all its ceaseless transformations."[2] Are there any ceaseless transformations in *scientific physics?* At the foot of the same page we find: "It is now demonstrated that there is no radical difference, no fundamental distinction in kind, between the vegetable

[1] The *Credentials of Science: the Warrant of Faith.* By Josiah Parsons Cooke, LL.D. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1888.

[2] P. 13.

and the animal kingdom." The demonstration here asserted must be a secret triumph of theoretical biology not yet revealed to the outside world. At page 15 the following occurs:

> "We are assured that there is 'a sense of gravitation' in plants; that the apex of a plant which turns towards the earth (geotropic) is 'a percipient organ'; that 'a brain function' may be ascribed to the sensitive apex of the root; and one observer claims to have traced 'a continuous fibrillar structure' in the substance of the cells (cytoplasm), by means of which stimuli may be transmitted in the motions of plants."

The reader may be surprised at seeing these metaphorical expressions, in which certain purely mechanico-vital movements of *vegetable* organisms are described by *analogy* with essentially different movements of *sentient* organisms, used as a proof of "the essential oneness of the two kingdoms of organic nature." We fear the second rule of syllogisms has been here overstrained. At page 22 we read: "Man's reason is the supernal Fact; but in fulfilment of one law, out of the deeps of nature's vast mystery, there has been formed and exalted even that sublime verity of reason, which now has upon its summit the Spirit's transcendent light." Further on the author declares that he accepts "clearly and positively the great generalization of the nineteenth century's science, viz., the genetic unity and the unbroken development of the whole realm of nature, to which we also belong." It is not plain how Mr. Smyth can reconcile the spirituality of the soul with its genesis from matter. Either the principle of causality which underlies his whole argumentation is not *universally* valid, or else the spiritual soul must have been and must be effected by a cause which transcends *matter*.

TRAITÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE. Conforme aux derniers programmes des Baccalauréats classique et moderne. Par le P. Gaston Sortais, S.J. Tome premier, Psychologie Expérimentale, pp. xxiv—594; tome deuxième, Morale, Esthetique, Metaphysique, pp. xxxi—864. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1902.

The practical necessity of unfolding and adapting philosophy so as to meet the requirements of youth applying for academic degrees in the State institutions has occasioned the publication of a goodly number of scholastic text-books in French. Some of these are excellent, but none that we have seen surpasses in merit the present *Traité* by Père Sortais. It is not a simple version or an adaptation of a Latin manual, but a fresh and in some respects an original recasting and a

new adaptation of Catholic philosophy. This is markedly true of the first volume, which is entirely devoted to experimental psychology as an introduction to the rest of the philosophical system. After the general preliminaries to experimental psychology (the science of conscious *phenomena* and their *laws*), the phenomena are grouped as *sensuous* (emotions, inclinations, passions), *intellectual* (perceptions, images, memories, abstract and general ideas, judgments, reasonings), and *volitional*. This classification lays the tripartite ground-plan of the volume. A fourth book is added to expose the psychology of language, and the reciprocal relations between body and soul. We would submit here, that the caption "Rapports du physique et du moral," under which the latter subject is treated, is misleading. *Moral* seems too specialized a term to cover the general psycho-physical interactions. A glance through the first book reveals to the student the special excellence of this portion of the work to lie in the full development given to the emotional aspect of man's nature. This is precisely the portion of psychology which is treated inadequately in our Latin texts. P. Sortais has revealed no little of its hidden wealth and bearings.

The strength of the second volume consists in its fresh and thorough treatment of special and critical logic—likewise a part of the Latin manuals that might well be expanded in view of its relation to modern sciences. P. Sortais takes particular care to explain the methods followed in the several departments of the sciences,—mathematical, physical, psychological, historical, moral, and social. He thus gives a concrete application of the logical processes, enabling the young student to realize the vital value of dialectics. Some may be disappointed at the comparatively short space devoted to metaphysics, general and special. It should be remembered, however, that the author has in view the requirements of the candidate for the Baccalaureate, to whom metaphysics is of less importance than empirical psychology, and the normative sciences,—logic, æsthetics, and ethics.

The work is intended to serve in the first instance as a text-book; hence literary form yields to didactics, and the pages throughout present to the eye all those devices of varied letterpress and schematic forms which go so far to facilitate study.

CAEREMONIALE EPISCOPORUM Clementis VIII, Innocentii X et Benedicti XIII jussu editum, Benedicti XIV et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Editio prima post typicam. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumpt. et Typis Friderici Pustet, S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit. Congr. Typogr. MDCCCCII.

If it be remembered that the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, unlike other rubrical commentaries and interpretations, however strictly official, is the only collection of ceremonies which is in every respect prescriptive, we realize at once how important even for the ordinary cleric is the study of this volume. It ranks in this regard with the Missal, the Breviary, the Ritual, and Pontifical, and in many cases supplements the rubrics of the liturgical texts where these fail to provide for special functions. Thus it is reckoned among what are called the primary sources of rubrical law, as distinguished from the *Decreta* of the S. Congregations, or the teachings of approved rubricists which constitute the secondary source. By an express declaration of Clement VIII, reënforced by a Bull of Benedict XIV, the regulations laid down in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* are absolutely binding, and may not be interpreted at discretion. The edition here presented is in the handy and beautiful form which distinguishes the Ratisbon liturgical publications.

A MANUAL OF ASCETICAL THEOLOGY; or, The Supernatural Life of the Soul on Earth and in Heaven. By the Rev. Arthur Devine, Passionist. London: R. & T. Washbourne; New York: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 616.

The spiritual man, that is to say, the man who measures things by the divine standard of value which gives him the scale of their true worth for eternity, finds it often difficult to see his way through the mists and clouds of earthly motives that crowd in upon his path. These mists or clouds hindering his progress may be made to yield him safe passage in two ways. If he fixes his eye upon his compass, that is, the Commandments, which the unchanging doctrine of faith sets forth, and if he struggles bravely on, keeping the machinery of duty going, and watching for the warning of danger-signals in the opposite direction, he is sure to make his way safely. Or if he uses the extraordinary expedient of dissipating the mists by the bright fires of devout fervor, indicated by the pursuit of the evangelical counsels, with the sacrifice of self-denial and heroic service of charity, he will triumph over the difficulties and give light to many fellow travellers,

besides safely steering his own course. Such is the twofold method of reaching perfection to which everybody is called, and especially we priests are bound by our very profession of faith.

It is mainly to the class called to adopt the second and more heroic measure, which promises, on the whole, greater efficiency in the work of salvation, that Father Devine addresses his treatise on the spiritual life. But, apart from the method, there is really little difference in the building up of the spiritual life, as there is none in the operations of grace. This the author indicates in referring to the subtitle of his work, *The Supernatural Life of the Soul on Earth and in Heaven.* "It is well known," he says, "that in respect to human beings and God's dealing with them, there are three forms of the supernatural which are manifested, to wit, miracles, revelations, and the operations of grace. It is of this last I have to treat, and to which the whole of the work is devoted—that is, to the science of the supernatural life of our souls as effected by grace and the virtues here, and perfected by the Beatific Vision on obtaining our last end in the possession of God in heaven. . . . It is the supernatural life of the soul, its development, and its final perfection that form the subject-matter of the present volume." This, of course, includes every species of tending to perfection.

The exposition of the process through which the soul attains the ultimate perfection of the supernatural life is made in the three main divisions of the work. In the first part we study the nature and the characteristic qualities or gifts which distinguish the supernatural life of the soul on earth. This includes a detailed view of the theological teaching regarding the reciprocal relation of the Divine Persons in the Holy Trinity, as well as the relation of the created soul to its Maker, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. It covers, furthermore, the tract of grace considered as an infused gift and as an actually operating influence in the soul. Thence we come to an examination of the process by which virtue becomes the endowment of the soul, operative under the fostering influence of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The second part of the work deals with the development of these endowments and gifts, carrying on the operations of the moral virtues wherein the idea of merit in its various phases—*de condigno, de congruo*—is unfolded. Here the operative influence of the Sacraments, principally the Blessed Eucharist, which brings about a peculiar union with Christ, is examined. Finally, in the third part the author takes up the consideration of the ultimate perfection of the supernatural state, which is

not attained on earth, but in heaven. The chapters on the Beatific Vision, the Condition of the Risen Body, the Pleasures of the Senses in Heaven, as compatible with absolute indefectibility and eternity of beatitude, form instructive material for the study of the theologian. The author appeals, of course, throughout to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church and to the masters of the spiritual life recognized by the universal Church, but he gives also abundant citations from the opinions of modern writers, such as Bucceroni, who succinctly sums up the general doctrine regarding the glorified state of the Blessed Virgin; or Ullathorne, who in his larger treatises on virtues and particularly in his book on *Patience* discusses in an exhaustive yet withal engaging way the different conditions of the soul striving after perfection. We imagine that Father Devine's book will be appreciated by the earnest theological student who during his Seminary course has perhaps seen only the more technical or professional side of such treatises as those on grace and merit, which are anything but inviting to the average practical mind.

LA SAINTE BIBLE POLYGLOTTE. Ancien Testament. Tome II—Josue, Les Juges, Ruth, Les Rois. Par F. Vigouroux, S.S. Paris: A. Roger et F. Chernoviz; Montreal: Cadieux et Derôme. 1901. Pp. 906.

An edition of the Bible containing the original Hebrew, the Septuagint Greek, the Latin Vulgate, together with a French version (taken from the Abbé Glaire), is a valuable help to the Scripture student of to-day, because we are constantly being referred to the older readings to settle the difficulties and doubts raised by the modern higher criticism. Thanks to the suggestions of the indefatigable Abbé Vigouroux, one of our former contributors, we have in this edition not only the original of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts and versions, but also the more important variations, which together with illustrative footnotes greatly enhance the helpfulness of the not too bulky volumes of this *Polyglotte*.

From a critical point of view the Book of Josue demands careful treatment. Hence the special value of the Introduction, which repeats not only the traditional method of settling the authorship question, but enters as well into a somewhat detailed description of the land, the climate, vegetation, and other local peculiarities of Palestine, including the portion lying east of the Jordan, all of which furnishes incidentally light for the proper understanding of the question of authenticity as well as for the interpretation of many passages

in the text itself. The brief account of the Book of Ruth which serves to illustrate the Davidic genealogy, needed but little comment, and the editor passes it over accordingly with a brief notice. As regards the Books of Kings, the two first of which bear the name of Samuel, the writer of the Introduction does not commit himself to any definite theory touching its authorship. Indeed the assumption of some of the Christian Fathers attributing the work to Samuel does not have much to corroborate it apart from the Babylonian Ghemara. Some recent authors have endorsed the belief that the first twenty-four chapters might be considered as Samuel's work, the rest being the composition of the Prophets Gad and Nathan. But as we get no light from the text itself, or from the statements of the Mishna or of Josephus, except the mention of the *Book of the Just* as furnishing the source of the elegy of David over the death of Saul and Jonathan, we must rest content with the theory that the actual composer of the first two books of Kings in their present form is known to us simply as one who rewrote or compiled from certain historic and prophetic documents in his hands, which work received the canonical sanction that makes us accept the books as inspired.

The two last books of Kings—in reality but one, since its division s due to the Septuagint and Vulgate editors—which cover a period of 427 years, continuing with the history of Solomon where the second book of Samuel ceases, have been frequently attributed to the pen of Jeremias. In reality there is a great similarity of thought and of style between these books and the writings otherwise attributed to the Prophet. The Talmud makes no doubt of this fact that Jeremias wrote the history of the Kings of Juda and of Israel; but there is of course no certainty on the subject, except in so far as the writer himself refers to his sources, namely, certain books of annals of the reign of Solomon and the separate kingdoms.

The volumes present an important addition to our text literature, so far as it is actually available.

"ORATE FRATRES" seu Euchologium ad usum Sacerdotum et Clericorum. Collegit, disposuit, edidit P. Gaudentius, Ex-Definitor General. Ord. Fratr. Minor., etc. Cum approbatione Archiepiscopali. Friburgi Brisgov.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. MCMI. Pp. 515.

In the matter of devotional books there are as many tastes as there are in approving the use of food and dress. Hence we need not grow

weary of new collections of prayers. Indeed, it is often useful to vary the exercises of piety by adopting for a time some new set of prayers or meditations, lest the habit of repeating the same forms beget a mechanical spirit without attention or devotional feeling. P. Gaudentius has made a good selection of *preces et pia exercitia ad usum quotidianum*, ejaculatory, special to the saints on whose lives the conduct of cleric and priest is to be modelled, prayers for morning and evening, methods for assisting at Mass, for celebrating it devoutly and edifyingly, prayers for special seasons of the year, practices of devotion for the months of the Holy Child, the Sacred Heart, for Passiontide, devotions in honor of our Blessed Lady during May and October, devotions in honor of the Angels, for the sinner, the sick, and the dying. These seem the common topics of the ordinary books of devotion, but our author has collated his material with special reference to the ecclesiastical calling, and thus the contents of the volume bear the impress of that ministry which is rendered efficient by nothing so much as thoughtful and devout prayer.

The typography is excellent and the volume of a becoming size to allow its convenient use under all ordinary circumstances.

Book Notes.

Mr. Russell Sturgis (*New York Times*, March 8), commenting upon a reproduction by the Caxton Club of a volume made for King Henry VIII, essays to interpret the inscription on the original cover, viz.:

REX : IN
AETERNUM :
VIVE : NE

as though it should be read: "Shall not the King live forever?" If that be the correct interpretation, then the reproduction is at fault by inserting a colon separating *vive* from *ne*. The colon should either give place to an *s*, connecting the two words and making it *vivesne*, or the translation should be: "Live, O King, forever." And since the *ne* is separated from the word *vive* by a colon (which, of course, has not here the significance of our modern punctuation mark, except that it indicates two distinct thoughts in the two words), it must be taken to introduce an elliptic phrase, and would contain the double interpreted answer: "Dost thou not (in reality do so)," and "Beware lest thou fail to do so!" As an epigraphical monitum, that play of words would be allowable. In ordinary writing we should repeat the entire thought with the implied refrain: "Nonne vives in aeternum? Cura ne pereas in aeternum." There may indeed be another interpretation for the *ne*, but it is not the one suggested by Mr. Sturgis.

Studies in Irish History and Biography, by C. L. Falkiner, is being issued by the Longmans. The volume deals mainly with eighteenth century characters. In this connection we would also mention a new *History of the County of Dublin*, by F. E. Ball, comprising the parishes of Monkstown, Kill o' the Grange, Dalkey, Killiney, Tully, Stillorgan, and Killmacud. To be published by Thom & Co., Dublin.

Miss Agnes Repplier, who has recently been honored with the degree of Doctor of Letters by the University of Pennsylvania, is not only an essayist of exquisite taste and originality in the field of domestic thought, but an earnest student of serious and religious literature as well. At present she is engaged upon a study of the history of pilgrimages—pilgrimages in every land and in every time. The result of her researches will appear shortly in THE DOLPHIN.

John Lane (London) is issuing a new edition of Aubrey de Vere's *Recollections*.

Students of early American history will be interested in a forthcoming series of papers on the life of Father Luis de Barbasto, the Florida martyr, by the Rev. L. A. Dutto, author of the recently published *Life of De Las Casas*, the first American priest. The series will be printed in THE DOLPHIN and THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The more we read of *Jesus Living in the Priest* the more we are impressed with the practical value of the book. The ten minutes given to its thoughtful perusal each morning of a young priest's life are apt to increase immeasurably the worth of his missionary activity.

Father Sheehan, author of *My New Curate*, is engaged upon an entirely new literary work which is likely to astonish the Philistines still more than his first anonymous venture into the field of clerical novels. The author is still in the prime of his mental vigor, and as his versatile genius is not being misspent in ephemeral efforts but is rather concentrated by retirement and study, it will not be surprising to find that his best work is yet to come. The *Delphinis* will have the privilege of knowing him first this time. Our readers have, no doubt, learnt already that the Holy Father has bestowed upon Father Sheehan the double honor of the theological Doctorate and a special medal in recognition of his services to Catholic literature.

Religion as a Credible Doctrine is the title of Mr. Mallock's new work to be published shortly by Chapman and Hall (London).

We are eagerly waiting for Mr. Henry Harland's promised new novel, *Lady Paramount*, which has been announced. His *The Cardinal's Snuffbox* was such an exquisite piece of work, and as interesting as it was truthful in its description of Catholic people, that we wish greatly to have more from the same source. Since the above mentioned work was published, the author has become a Catholic.

Père Lagrange, O.P., head of the College of Biblical Studies in Jerusalem, and editor of the *Revue Biblique Internationale*, who stands unquestionably at the head

of the Catholic school that aims at meeting with their own weapons the champions of advanced Biblical criticism, will have an article in the May issue of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN.

THE DOLPHIN is being apparently patronized by Anglicans. We learn from one of them that it is liked, and we trust that it will make converts by correcting some of the false notions about Roman Catholics which current prejudice fosters. The cover of THE DOLPHIN puzzles some persons. We would say in explanation that it varies with each number, indicating the liturgical colors of the different ecclesiastical seasons.

In addition to Father Peter O'Leary's *Irish Phrase Book*, which has just gone into a second edition, we have now a *Leabhar Cainte* of choice idiomatic Gaelic phrases collected by J. J. Doyle and edited by Stephen Barrett. The volume is published by the Dublin Gaelic League.

Father Henry's marvellously happy renderings of Pope Leo's poetic thoughts are being duly appreciated by the literary critics even of the secular (non-Catholic) press, to whom they have been submitted for an expression of opinion. The old cry of Catholics having to seek patronage among their fellows is being slightly reversed—at least in the case of THE DOLPHIN. Father Sheehan and Father Henry get better treatment from the unbiased judges, who see only their literary merit, than from the Catholic press which has the wider range of religious approbation to add to its just meed of praises.

Day Dreams of a Schoolmaster, by Professor Darcy Wentworth Thompson, who died a short time ago, deserves to be republished.

Half a century after the strongly anti-Catholic novels published during the anti-Tractarian feeling in England and the Knownothing madness in the United States, American and English novelists have fully perceived the artistic value of a good priest in a piece of fiction. Here and there, ignorance puts forward the ancient caricature; but for one novel disgraced by him there are at least two in which the real churchman is seen. The latest is "Fra Donato," in Mr. Clinton Scollard's *The Cloistering of Ursula*, a brave friar who dares to protect the innocent even at the peril of his life, who is sufficiently astute to outwit the wicked, and wise enough to be the trusted friend of the rulers of men. Mr. Scollard also presents the case of an archbishopric held by a daring and mercenary layman and shows how disgrace fell upon the Church through him. It is doubtful if fifty years ago there was a Protestant novelist in the country sufficiently well read in Catholic matters to think of such a situation, and certainly there was not one whose delicacy of feeling would have led him to refrain from any word by which one can guess what weak pope, what scheming cardinal were responsible for yielding to the demand for the appointment. It is a long way from *Beatrice* to *The Cloistering of Ursula*. In the note on this romance in "Recent Popular Books" for March the characters were said to "treat their duels as coolly as Collins," the last word should have been *Cellini*.

Father Herbert Thurston, S.J., who has been, as we stated before, making special studies among the *Incunabula* of the British Museum, is at present in Paris for the purpose of examining some MSS. in the Mazarine collection and in the French National Library. He will have an article in our June issue on *The Earliest Popular Almanac—The Shepherd's Calendar*. The history of the book is interesting, and we expect to give some specimens of its numerous curious illustrations.

Eugene Sullivan's (*Eoghan Ruadh Ua Suilleabhain*) poems have been collected by Father P. S. Dinneen, and are now published by the Dublin Gaelic League.

The title of Mr. Cyrus Townsend Brady's *Barbarossa*, noticed in the "Recent Popular Books" of the March DOLPHIN, has been changed to *Hohenzollern*.

The *Providence Visitor* (February 22) cleverly sketches the work of THE DOLPHIN as superior to any of our leading periodicals which have appealed to the educated Catholic public of English-speaking countries. But it does not believe that there are enough educated Catholics to support the enterprise. We do not wish to enter into a discussion as to the reasons for such a supposition; but if it were true, we should wonder what the Catholic colleges and academies must have been doing for their hundreds or thousands of graduates in superior courses. But we are thinking of what an interesting symposium might be evolved by comparing statements about our Catholic backwardness in culture with the grandiloquent self-congratulations heard from time to time in panegyrics, editorials, and after-dinner speeches where the presence of heroes in purple or black provokes belief in the things that are not seen. "We have, without doubt," said a leading churchman recently, "the most intelligent, most broadly learned, and most devoted clergy in the world, if we compare Catholics with Protestants." If the clergy are really the educators of the laity, as one should suppose, we must surely have a fair contingent of cultured Catholics who realize that knowledge and religion so mutually enhance each other as to produce the highest type of lady or gentleman.

The Benzigers are doing earnest good work in their various recent issues of books for young people. Their efforts to establish a genuinely Catholic family library, which scheme includes their monthly magazine, deserve every encouragement on the part of our clergy.

The story of *Joan of Arc* by Anatole France, soon to be published in Paris, will be immediately translated into English.

Recent Popular Books.

ANTICIPATIONS: H. G. Wells. *Harper.* $1.80 *net.*

The essays in this volume deal with the wars and locomotion of the future; its probable common language; the rearrangements and new policies arising from novel inventions, in short, with what may happen in this century. The ignorant and the illogical may be harmed by it; the vicious may detach many of its clever phrases for their own purpose; the feeble may be too severely shocked by its statement of difficulties to apprehend their solution, and it cannot, therefore, be recommended without innumerable reservations. A robustly pious and fairly educated man could hardly fail to enjoy it, and to receive benefit from it, if he read all of it, and judged it in its entirety.

ASSASSINS: A. M. Meakin. *Holt.* $1.50.

The author denies himself no extravagance in gems, jewels, architecture or landscape gardening, in his description of the domains of the Grand Master of the Assassins, and amply illustrates the supremacy of his control of his disciples. The hero and heroine, his follower and his captive, do indeed refuse to fulfil his orders to kill Saladin, but one bolt from a crossbow kills them at the very moment when they seem triumphant, and fate overtakes all other rebels much more swiftly. The Sultan and his brother are the most important real personages, and although rather highly colored, the story very well summarizes what is known of an execrable secret society.

CAPTAIN JENKS—HERO: Ernest Crosby. *Funk.* $1.50.

The chief character's nature indicates ideal fitness for the corps to which the original bearer of his name belonged. His sinfully thoughtless father cultivates an evil disposition by giving him a set of toy soldiers, and he learns to love to play with them, descends to the yet deeper evil of wanting to be a hero; goes to West Point and longs to be hazed, because great generals have had the same experience; enters the army and perceives non-existnte evils, and, as a whole, entirely fails to accomplish the sole purpose of his creation, which seems to be to cast discredit upon war in general, upon the government of the United States, and the good sense of Americans.

CHARLOTTE: L. B. Walford. *Longmans.* $1.50.

An unsparing portrait of the modern flirt, setting her vocabulary and her methods in a very strong light, and showing her mischievous and demoralizing influence. The book closes with the heroine's desertion of her betrothed on the morning set for their wedding, and her marriage to a man affianced to another. The sort of mother who rears a girl of this species is very well shown, and the book, although less pleasant than its author's former stories, is much abler.

COURTSHIP OF SWEET ANNE PAGE: Ellen V. Talbot. *Funk.* $0.50.

A very little book in pseudo Elizabethan English, telling very few things not set down, according to the best of his ability, by one William Shakspere, upon whose account the author hardly improves.

DECOY: Francis Dana. *Lane.* $1.50.

A description of the devices by which spiritualist mediums obtain the information needed to dupe the foolish who consult them, and to control those who permit themselves to play with their evil art, is made part of a love story. The cool confessions of certain retired "mediums" furnish the author's information, and the book should deter any woman from taking any part in "circles," and from consulting "mediums," and especially from playing with "mes-

merism," "hypnotism," "mind-reading," and all juggling with brain and nerves.

EVE TRIUMPHANT: Pierre de Coulevain. Translated by Alys Hallard. *Putnam.* $1.50.

The Parisian and Roman experience of an American wife and an American girl, and the misunderstandings between them and certain French and Italian men of good family are the subject of the story, which seems based upon thorough acquaintance with both types. The frank, unsuspicious trustfulness of the women, and the viciousness of the men are artfully contrasted, and, although the better element is triumphant, the complacency of the worse is hardly disturbed. It is not a book for an American girl to read, excepting those about to meet men similar to those in the story. The heroine is converted, and some very fine things are said of the Church, but the influence of the book is anything but religious. That she receives the Sacrament of Confession before Baptism, and is baptized wearing "a black toque trimmed with Parma violets," are details.

FIFTH STRING: J. P. Sousa. *Bowen.* $1.25.

A violinist traffics with Satan, who gives him a wonderful violin with a fifth string, upon which he must not play, on penalty of death. He wins fame without transgressing the conditions, but the girl for whom he has sold his soul bids him play on the forbidden string or lose her, and he obeys and dies.

FIGHTING BISHOP: Herbert M. Hopkins. *Bowen.* $1.50.

The bishop is of the American Episcopal Church, and has a wife and eight children. The book relates the story of his life during the years including Lincoln's election and the Civil War, in which some of his sons are killed. The battle of Gettysburg is described, and also the New York draft riots, and scenes in the army hospital frequented by Walt Whitman. The book is not controversial, but the bishop disapproves of Catholics and occasionally speaks his mind, and as he has a daughter-in-law whose evil conduct is fully described, the story is scarcely worthy of a Catholic's attention.

GARDEN IN THE SUBURBS: Mrs. Leslie Williams. *Lane.* $1.25 *net.*

This differs from most "garden" books in being adapted to the needs of the owner of a plot containing less than two square rods, about two American city "lots." The prices of plants and seeds are English, and also the seasons considered, but the value of the volume lies in the suggested variety of plants and methods of treatment, and in some excellent pictures.

GIANTS' GATEWAY: Max Pemberton. *Stokes.* $1.50.

The hero, a French general, adored by the populace, tests a submarine boat offered to the ministry of war by crossing the Channel and going up the Thames, passing through the "Giants' Gate," the mines and torpedoes at the mouth. He becomes the centre of a conspiracy, barely fails to grasp imperial power, and is left imprisoned with the prospect of marrying the heroine as soon as his term expires. Many actual incidents of French history during the last four years are brought into the plot and ingeniously connected, and the Jews and their influence are denounced with apparent sincerity. In spite of some inconsistencies, the book is clever, and it has a relentlessly true portrait of a French literary woman self-advertised as having immense political influence.

GLASS AND GOLD: J. O. G. Duffy. *Harper.* $1.50.

A girl belonging to a sect of fanatics practising public confession, owns in the presence of the congregation that she is a sinner, and is much surprised when her betrothed declines to marry her, and society closes its doors to her. Her story pursues her across the continent and even to England, but in the end she finds a man willing to forgive her, and her betrayer, who has become a Protestant monk and remained a scoundrel, comes to a bad end. The tendency of the story is to excuse lax conduct and to profane the ideal of charity.

GREYSTONE: William Jasper Nicolls. *Lippincott.* $1.50.

A pretty Irish girl and her aunt, coming to the United States hire the little country seat of an army officer, who promptly falls in love with the girl, and is rejected because she has thoughtlessly engaged herself to an ill-conditioned Englishman. This person accommodatingly falls into evil ways and so frees her to follow her inclinations. This book is very well written and some chapters are idyllic.

HESTER BLAIR: William Henry Carson. *C. M. Clark.* $1.50.

A story of a secret marriage and of the wife's troubles when the husband dies without acknowledging her. The book ends with her second marriage and the discomfiture of the villain. The tale is very long, with an unnecessarily large company of characters, but it is one of the clean, simple stories that attract simple persons, unaccustomed to reading.

JAPAN: Mortimer Mempes. *Black.* $6.00.

The text of this book includes descriptions of Japanese artists and artisans and their work, more minute than are commonly written, and founded on long residence and intimacy with the men and their productions. The pictures are both curious and instructive, but the book is rather for the architect, the artist and the decorator than for unprofessional persons.

KATE BONNET: Frank Stockton. *Appleton.* $1.50.

The behavior of a half-crazy Barbadoes planter turned pirate for amusement; the perplexed distress of his daughter and her hesitation between her two lovers; and the conduct of Thach, or Blackbeard, a pirate of the fine old school of brutality, make up the story. All the personages have much capacity for bewildering themselves and one another, and the author compels the reader to smile at them, howsoever serious their case may be, and heightens the smile by cleverly turned comment.

LACHMI BAI: Michael White. *Taylor.* $1.50.

The endeavor of the Rani of Jhansi, at the time of the Indian Mutiny, to regain possession of the kingdom of which the English had dispossessed her is here related with many imagined details. The princess donned male attire and led her soldiers in many battles, one of which she won. The fancied parts of the story entirely lack Oriental coloring, but Lachmi is a genuine heroine.

LOVE IN ITS TENDERNESS: J. G. Aitken. *Appleton.* $1.50.

A series of sketches of Scottish village life related without too much indulgences in the Doric, and in tone preserving a just mean between Mr. Barrie's sentiment and Mr. Douglass' disposition to blacken the character of the Scottish rustic. Unfortunately, the characters are Calvinists and their prayers and discourse on religion occupy many pages.

MADEMOISELLE FOUCHETTE: Charles Theodore Murray. *Lippincott.* $1.50.

The heroine, a Parisian waif, is brought to the attention of the police by a ruffian's attempt to drown her, and is placed under the care of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd whom the author roundly abuses. After five years, she runs away to escape undeserved punishment, and passing through many adventures, at last sacrifices herself to the happiness of a girl whom she has discovered to be her sister. The author's standard of frankness is French, and he chooses some characters generally conceded to be unmentionable.

MADNESS OF PHILIP: Josephine Dodge Daskam. *McClure.* $1.50.

Truthful, and therefore wildly funny descriptions of kindergarten doings; and stories of the strange freaks of childhood, and of children's pathetic misunderstandings of life, of their elders, and of one another. The book is neither sentimental nor coarse, like much work of its species; it is written in the English language; and since

the stories of which it is composed began to appear they have been unsuccessfully imitated by three several authors.

MELOMANIACS: James Huneker. *Scribner.* $1.50.

A volume of stories in which the failings, weaknesses, and besetting sins of the musician are unsparingly described, especial stress being laid on vanity and on the fallacy that the artistic temperament excuses folly and sin. They are not pretty stories, but they may palliate some of the evils which they condemn, and prevent some weak souls from being subdued by "artistic" pretensions.

METHODS OF LADY WALDERHURST: Frances Hodgson Burnett. *Stokes.* $1.50.

The heroine of "The Making of a Marchioness" is shown during her engagement to the marquis, and after her marriage, and the reader sees her conquering envy, meanness, and even murderous intent by the charity that thinks not of evil. It is a pretty story, excellently illustrated, and the originality of the heroine and the hero's likeness to the average British peer are preserved to the very end.

NAUGHTY NAN: John Luther Long. *Century.* $1.50.

The heiress of a fortune bequeathed on condition of her marriage to a distant cousin, loves another cousin and tries to make him persuade her to break her pledges. He refuses, and after many long talks applies to the betrothed man to release her, and discovers that he has already pledged himself to another. The book has humor and cleverness, but they are made ineffective by dissipation in pointless chatter.

PATRICIA OF THE HILLS: C. K. Burrow. *Putnam.* $1.00.

A beautiful Irish girl becomes a public singer, in the hope of repairing the family fortunes wrecked by her father. Her two lovers, the reckless heir of a peerage, and a worthy young squire, remain faithful, but she will not marry the former because she does not love him, and she thinks that the squire does not love her as devotedly as he should. Comments on the land question and enthusiastic praise of the Irish peasants' character are freely scattered throughout the book which ends happily.

POLICEMAN FLYNN: Elliott Flower. *Century.* $1.50.

Flynn, a big, brave, rather slow man, illiterate, but with occasional vivid flashes of cleverness, is shown in his encounters with crime, with boyish mischief, with his wife's attempts to improve him, with corrupt politics, and many other evils to be found in a policeman's lot; and if he be not always happily triumphant, he is always triumphantly funny, and his brogue is good, and he has found the sure cure for an anarchistic street orator.

ROCKHAVEN: Charles Clarke Munn. *Lee.* $1.50.

The hero is intentionally made commonplace in everything except heroic honesty, and the heroine is a simple girl with a genius for violin-playing, but otherwise not remarkable. Their love affair is exactly on the level of the average American reader's apprehension and experience, and an honest but perfectly moral disbeliever in the prevalent Calvinism amid which he lives is drawn from the life. The story seems exactly adapted to its end, which is to show simple readers the means by which sham stock companies, soliciting their money through advertisements and the post office, rob them and leave them penniless. The "bucket shops" are also described, and the story, simple as it is, suffices to carry the sermon.

ROYAL ROGUES: Alberta Bancroft. *Putnam.* $1.35.

A fairy romance in which the twin sons of a fairy prince, with Puck and their kobold friends, encounter nixies and elves of many kinds, and after a terrible struggle with witches, meet their mother's father, and reconcile the quarrel between him and their parents. [Eight to ten years.]

STORY OF EDEN: Dolf Wyllarde. *Lane.* $1.50.

South African English society, military and civilian, is here exhibited as hopelessly corrupt, and the reason for its condition is stated to be irresponsibility based on the feeling that everything is temporary. The heroine, so elaborately innocent that her conversation is chiefly remarks capable of double interpretation, sins flagrantly as soon as she has an opportunity, and then marries an excellent man. Her lover and a man who knows of her conduct then go into action and are shot, and she feels that a chapter in her life is closed, but has no other especial emotion. Nothing is left to the reader's fancy.

VALLEY OF DECISION: Edith Wharton. *Scribner.* 2 vols. $2.00.

The hero, after a youth of vicissitudes, is acknowledged as the heir apparent of a dukedom and sees the life of the Italian upper classes in the period immediately preceding and during the French Revolution. He becomes acquainted with many of the Illuminati, and through the influence of a certain Signorina Vivaldi he attempts, when he becomes Duke, to give his people a constitution, but they angrily reject it. Later, the Liberal party forces him to abdicate. In the course of the tale, he accepts many erroneous judgments of the Church, but knowledge removes his doubts of every species. An admirable Jesuit; a picture of Alfieri; some scenes; Cagliostro not much disguised; court intrigues of some subtlety are adjuncts of the story, but it is the Jesuit's arguments which dominate everything at the close. The morality of the time necessitates certain references not fit for a very young girl's reading, but such an one will find nothing worse in the story than her school-books will tell her. The style is that of the eighteenth century, and interpolated imitations of Arthur Young and Le Sage are surpassingly good.

VIRGINIAN; A Horseman of the Plains: Owen Wister. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

The hero, first a cowboy, and later a species of superintendent, is brave and silent, and shows himself, during a revolt against his authority, to be sagacious and a manager of men. His attempts to reach his own standard of worthiness to marry the woman whom he loves, are pathetic, and his comments on books, art, and life are extraordinarily inept, and yet shrewd within the limits of his knowledge.

WINDING ROAD: Elizabeth Godfrey. *Holt.* $1.50.

The hero, one of those abnormal creatures to whom wandering is the only life possible, belongs to a good family, is educated, and charms all who hear his violin-playing. The heroine, an orphan, weary of the monotony of farm life, yields to his wooing, marries him, and the two wander away together, she playing the harp and he the violin. He never ceases to love her in his fashion, but the desire of change, of making a long journey, seizes him more than once; she, perfectly faithful in heart, wearies of incessant travelling, and when he returns from one of his excursions, he finds her and his little son dead together. The story is exquisitely written, and the hero is a new character.

WOLFVILLE DAYS: Alfred E. Lewis. *Stokes.* $1.50.

Life in a mining town is described in three times as much rude language as is necessary to express the thought. The book is meant to be humorous, but is drawlingly tedious. Still, a similar book, published four years ago, sold well, as the author boasts in a preface wonderfully bad in taste and grammatical construction.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY.

DIE SIMONIE. Ein Kanonistische Studie. Von A. Leinz, Doctor Beider Rechte, Divisionspfarrer. Mit Approbation des hochw. Herrn Erzbischofs von Freiburg. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 154. Preis, $0.85.

A FEW FIRST PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. A Spiritual Instruction to Religious Men and Women. By Fr. H. Reginald Buckler, O.P. London: Burns and Oates; New York: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 52. Price, $0.25.

WHERE IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST? By M. Van der Hagen, S.J. With the approbation of the Church. Translated from the Dutch by the Rev. Alphonsus Canon Van de Rydt. Bruges, Belgium: Society of St. Augustine. 1902. Pp. 200. Price, 10d.

OFFICIA PASSIONIS. Officia Propria Mysteriorum et Instrumentorum Passionis D. N. J. C. juxta Breviarium Romanum, cum Psalmis et Precibus in extenso. Cum approbatione Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis. Ratisbonae, Romae, et Neo Eboraci. Sumptibus et typis Friderici Pustet. 1899. Pp. iv—156. Pretium, $0.75.

AVANT ET APRÈS LA COMMUNION. Par M. l'abbé P. Lejeune, Chanoine Honoraire de Reims. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1902. Pp. xii—396. Prix, 3 fr.

LEHRBUCH DER RELIGION. Ein Handbuch zu Deharbe's katholischem Katechismus und ein Lesebuch zum Selbstunterrichte. Von W. Wilmers, S.J. Sechste verbesserte Auflage herausgegeben von Aug. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Erster Band: Lehre vom Glauben. Münster: Aschendorff. 1902. Pp. 698. Preis, 25 marks.

CÆREMONIALE EPISCOPORUM, Clementis VIII, Innocentii X et Benedicti XIII jussu editum, Benedicti XIV et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Editio prima post typicam. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati, Sumptibus et typis Friderici Pustet. MDCCCCII. Pp. xix—388. Pretium, $1.00 *net*.

DIE RELIGIÖSEN BESTREBUNGEN DER GEGENWART INNERHALB DER KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHE. Hirtenbrief des hochwürdigsten Herrn Bischofs von Trier, Michael Felix Korum, vom 28 Jan. 1902. Freier Druck und Verlag der Paulinus Druckerei. 1902. Pp. 32. Preis, brosch., 30 Pfg.

PHILOSOPHY.

TRAITÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE. Conforme aux derniers programmes des Baccalauréats classique at moderne. Par le P. Gaston Sortais, S.J. Tome premier, Psychologie Expérimentale, pp. xxiv—594; tome deuxième, Logique, Morale, Esthétique. Metaphysique, pp. xxxi—864. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1902. 2 vols., 12 francs.

THE MASTERY OF THE PACIFIC. By Archibald R. Colquhoun. With special Maps, Frontispiece, and more than one hundred Illustrations from Original Sketches and Photographs. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. xvi—440. Price, $4.00 *net*.

THROUGH SCIENCE TO FAITH. By Newman Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902. Pp. x—282. Price, $1.50 *net.*

DIE SIBYLLE VON TIBUR. Schauspiel in drei Aufzügen, gedichtet und neu bearbeitet von Emilie Ringseis. Zweite Auflage. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1896. Pp. 90.

HISTORY.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS JÜDISCHE ALTERTHÜMER. Uebersetzt von Dr. Fr. Kaulen. Dritte Auflage. Köln am Rhein: J. P. Bachem; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. x—722. Preis, $3.15, *net.*

JOURNAL INTIME DE MONSEIGNEUR DUPANLOUP, Évêque d'Orléans. Extraits recueillis et publiés par L. Branchereau, Supérieur du Grand Séminaire d'Orleans. Paris: Ancienne Maison Douniol, P. Téqui. 1902. Pp. 368. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

LES MARTYRS. Par le R. P. Dom H. Leclerq, O.S.B. Recueil de pièces authentiques sur les martyrs depuis les origines du christianisme jusqu'au XX^e^ siècle. Tome I—Les Temps Néroniens et le Deuxième Siècle. Précédé d'une introduction. Paris: H. Oudin. 1902. Pp. cxi—229. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, and Clergy List for the United States and Canada. Official. Quarterly. Milwaukee, Wis.: The M. H. Wiltzius Company. 1902. Price, $1.25.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE YOUNG MAN IN MODERN LIFE. By Beverly Warner, D.D., Author of *Facts and the Faith; A Study in the Rationalism of the Apostles' Creed*, etc. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 1902. Pp. xi—193. Price, $0.85 net.

MICHAEL ROSS, MINISTER. By Annie E. Holdsworth, author of *Joanna Traill, Spinster; The Gods Arrive*, etc. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company. 1902. Pp. 331. Price, $1.50.

MARY TRACY'S FORTUNE. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 169. Price, 45 cents.

BUNT AND BILL. By Clara Mulholland. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 153. Price, 45 cents.

RECRUIT TOMMY COLLINS. By Mary G. Bonesteel. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 148. Price, 45 cents.

AS TRUE AS GOLD. By Mary E. Mannix. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 162. Price, 45 cents.

GRAMMATICA LINGUAE HEBRAICAE cum Exercitiis et Glossario, studiis academicis accommodata, a Fr. Vinc. Zapletal, O. Praed., Exegeseos Vet. Test. in Universitate Friburgensi (Helv.) Professore Ordinario. Paderbornae Sumptibus Ferdinandi Schoeningh. 1902. Pp. viii—130. Preis, Mk. 2.80.

THE SIEGE OF LADY RESOLUTE. A Novel. By Harris Dickson. New York and London: Harper & Brothers. 1902. Pp. 379. $1.50.

ANTICIPATIONS of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress Upon Life and Thought. By H. G. Wells, author of *When the Sleeper Wakes, War of the Worlds, Invisible Man.* New York and London: Harper & Brothers. 1902. Pp. 343. Price, $1.80 *net.*